

The Department of State

ERVENOR LIBRARY

JUN 18 1956

bulletin

Vol. XXXIV, No. 884

June 4, 1956



**WORKING TOGETHER FOR INTERNATIONAL
UNDERSTANDING • Address by President Eisenhower . 915**

VISIT OF PRESIDENT SUKARNO OF INDONESIA . 927

**INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION TO DEVELOP
WATER RESOURCES**

Statement by John C. Baker 949

Text of ECOSOC Resolution 951

**FINANCING THE CONTINUING MOVEMENT OF
MIGRANTS FROM EUROPE • Article by**

George L. Warren 944

For index see inside back cover



The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXXIV, No. 884 • PUBLICATION 6350

June 4, 1956

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 19, 1955).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Working Together for International Understanding

Address by President Eisenhower¹

Members of the graduating class and fellow Texans:

The honor you have conferred on me joins me with a great school, of great traditions, of great achievements, of great goals. Baylor's 10 schools and colleges are the fruition of seeds planted in 1845 at Old Independence. Baylor's graduates in positions of leadership testify to the wisdom and foresight of Baylor's founders. Your magnificent Armstrong Browning Library exemplifies the growth of Baylor as a principal cultural center of the Southwest.

This university is dedicated to true education; it strives to develop wisdom. This implies, over and beyond mere knowledge, an understanding of men's relationship to their fellow men in a world created for their stewardship by a God in whose image they are all made. You have been taught here to do justice and to love mercy and to walk humbly before your Maker even as you use every opportunity to better yourselves through the profession in which you have been here grounded.

Now you enter a new phase of your life experience—in a world where the principles by which you live are frequently flouted and ignored. What is your place in this world? What can you do to improve it? Pointedly, what can each one of you as an individual do to promote a world society that respects the values in which you, and this school, believe so deeply? The thoughts I bring to you this morning deal primarily—and

that sketchily—with the international phases of a suggested answer.

I speak of international affairs for a very simple reason. In the fundamental struggle in which the world is now engaged, world issues create, or at least color, almost every domestic question and problem.

Clear comprehension of the basic factors involved is vitally important to leaders and officials and to every citizen of this country and of the free world. Such understanding, I submit, is especially important to you young people who, perforce, must look at these critical current problems against a horizon of 10, 20, 40 years hence.

Today a militant, aggressive communistic doctrine is dominant over much of the world's surface and over hundreds of millions of the world's people. In the postwar period we have seen it indulge in a particularly cynical type of colonialism, expressed in the Communist subjugation of once free and proud nations in Europe and in Asia. Simultaneously, in the free areas of the world, 600 million people in more than a score of new countries have achieved independence.

Communism denies the spiritual premises on which your education has been based. According to that doctrine, there is no God; there is no soul in man; there is no reward beyond the satisfaction of daily needs. Consequently, toward the human being, communism is cruel, intolerant, atheistic. This doctrine, committed to conquest by lure, intimidation, and force, seeks to destroy the political concepts and institutions that we hold to be dearer than life itself. Thus communism poses a threat from which even this mighty Nation is not wholly immune.

¹ Made at the commencement ceremonies at Baylor University, Waco, Tex. on May 25 (White House press release).

Yet communism is, in deepest sense, a gigantic failure.

Even in the countries it dominates, hundreds of millions who dwell there still cling to their religious faith; still are moved by aspirations for justice and freedom that cannot be answered merely by more steel and bigger bombers; still seek a reward that is beyond money or place or power; still dream of the day that they may walk fearlessly in the fullness of human freedom.

The destiny of man is freedom and justice under his Creator. Any ideology that denies this universal faith will ultimately perish or be recast. This is the first great truth that must underlie all our thinking, all our striving in this struggling world.

Fundamental Principles of Human Liberty

A second truth is that the fundamental principles of human liberty and free government are powerful sources of human energy, loyalty, dedication—and guides to enduring success. They are mightier than armaments and armies.

Americans have recognized those two truths in the historical documents of the Republic. They are repeated in the preamble to the fundamental policy statement in our current series of national security directives. In part that preamble reads:

The spiritual, moral and material posture of the United States of America rests upon established principles which have been asserted and defended throughout the history of the Republic. The genius, strength and promise of America are founded in the dedication of its people and government to the dignity, equality and freedom of the human being under God.

These concepts and our institutions which nourish and maintain them with justice are the bulwark of our free society and are the basis of the respect and leadership which have been accorded our nation by the peoples of the world.

Much as we are dedicated to this expression of lofty sentiment, it will count for little unless every American, to the extent of his influence and capacity, daily breathes into it the life of his own practice. The test is the readiness of individuals to cleave to principle even at the cost of narrower, more immediate gains.

For you graduates, and for all citizens, opportunities to strengthen our assault on injustice and bigotry will be as numerous as the tasks you undertake and the people you meet each day. Nothing I might add could either quicken your recognition of such opportunities or strengthen your response

to them. But certain it is that in this recognition and this response will be found the measure of America's future safety, progress, and greatness.

The third great truth that must underlie our thinking on international questions is this: People are what count. A sympathetic understanding of the aspirations, the hopes and fears, the traditions and prides of other peoples and nations is essential to the promotion of mutual prosperity and peace. Such understanding is a compulsory requirement on each of us if, as a people, we are to discharge our inescapable national responsibility to lead the world in the growth of freedom and human dignity.

Communism seeks to dominate or to destroy; freedom seeks to cooperate and to help others to build. But these basic differences are not self-evident. Therefore, the people of the world are not necessarily thinking in terms of opposing concepts of communistic dictatorship and of human rights and freedom.

Rather, today, the most unyielding expression of peoples' aspirations seems to be an intense nationalism. There is nothing to be feared in this—of itself. The right of a people, capable of self-government, to their own political institutions is deeply imbedded in American thinking. Among peoples as among our own citizens we believe the rights of the weak are identical with those of the strong. And in the past we have helped many small nations to independence. We will continue to hail with satisfaction the birth of each new nation whose people, achieving independence and freedom, become peaceful members of the world community.

In this day, however, one acute economic problem grows more acute as each new nation steps forward to an independent place in the international family. New nations, springing up, create new political boundaries. Far too often these political boundaries become serious barriers to the flow of trade.

Such barriers are daily of more importance as increasing industrialization and specialization critically increase the economic interdependence of peoples. Specialization in any area—which implies an unbalanced local economy—is not necessarily a weakness, provided always that there is free opportunity for exchanging a portion of the products of such specialization for the other things needed to satisfy the requirements of people.

This means that, where any nation does not possess, within its own boundaries, the major elements of a broadly balanced economy, it is normally handicapped in assuring maximum satisfaction of human wants and a stable prosperity for its own people. So we find that the emotional urge for a completely independent existence may conflict with an equal desire for higher living standards.

This conflict, so obvious, is often ignored. But even the productivity and prosperity of this great country would vanish if our States were 48 separate nations, with economic and political barriers at each boundary preventing or impeding the interflow of goods, people, and information.

We must put to ourselves this question: How can we help answer both the great desire of peoples for a separate, independent existence and the need for economic union or, at least, effective cooperation among them?

This question is of vital importance to every nation. Unhappiness, unrest, and disaffection caused by depressed living standards can be as acute as when caused by political injustice. Disaffection, long continued, in any portion of the earth, can bring about political convulsions and grave global crises. In Communist areas the answer is achieved by compulsion.

But effective cooperation is not easily accomplished among free nations. Permit me in one illustration to point up the difficulty, among free peoples, of progress toward this type of union.

Progress Toward European Unity

The statesmen of Western Europe have long been aware that only in broad and effective cooperation among the nations of that region can true security for all be found. They know that real unification of the separate countries there would make their combined 250 million highly civilized people a mighty pillar of free strength in the modern world. A free United States of Europe would be strong in the skills of its people, adequately endowed with material resources, and rich in their common cultural and artistic heritage. It would be a highly prosperous community.

Without such unification the history of the past half century in Europe could go on in dreary repetition, possibly to the ultimate destruction of all the values those people hold most dear. With unification, a new sun of hope, security, and confidence would shine for Europe and for the free world.

Why, then, has this great objective not been attained by intelligent peoples? The basic reasons are simply stated. First: it is the great pride of each nation in separate existence. Second: it is the intense fear of losing, in such a union, cherished local traditions and cultural and political institutions and of suffering temporary economic dislocations. We, of course, appreciate the weight of such considerations—and are therefore patient—even though the history of this largest of our States refutes the fears that seem to loom so large in Europe.

Another stumbling block to European unity is the failure of populations as a whole to grasp the long-term political, economic, and security advantage of union. These are matters that do not make for a soul-stirring address on a national holiday. They can be approached only in thought, in wisdom—almost, we might say, in prayer.

Nevertheless—and happily—much progress has been made.

Years ago, our European partners began both to study and to act. Our country's help was given wherever possible because our own future security and prosperity are inescapably linked to those of our European friends. There was established the Brussels Compact, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the European Payments Union, the European Coal and Steel Community, and the Council of Europe. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO, although an organization comprehending much more than Western Europe, nevertheless provides the cooperative mechanism for greater security in the area. All these were set up to attack immediate problems in cooperation.

Despite setbacks and difficulties, these have been operating with increasing efficiency. So, European Union, one of the greatest dreams of Western man, seems nearer today than at any time in centuries, providing bright promise for the future of our European friends and for the growth and strength of liberty.

Developing Nonmilitary Aspects of NATO

On a broader geographical scale, members of the Atlantic Community are working together in many different ways and through many different agencies. But such cooperation can usefully be further developed. At the NATO meeting several weeks ago it was decided that the members of the Atlantic Community should "examine actively

further measures which might be taken at this time to advance more effectively their common interests."² They designated a committee of three Foreign Ministers to advise on "ways and means to improve and extend NATO co-operation in non-military fields and to develop greater unity within the Atlantic Community."

This effort recognizes the truth that all peoples of the free world must learn to work together more effectively in the solution of our common problems or the battle for human liberty cannot be won. Among equals, attempting to perform a difficult task, there is no substitute for cooperation.

It is gratifying to all of us to know that Senator Walter George has agreed to act as my personal representative and special ambassador in working for this new evolution of the Atlantic Community. Nothing could testify more forcefully to the critical importance of this project than the willingness of Senator George to undertake it.

Patiently but persistently we must work on. We must take into account man's hunger for freedom and for food; all men's dignity as well as some men's power; the eventual triumph of right and justice over expediency and force.

The responsibility for carrying forward America's part in helping improve international cooperation cannot be met through paper work in a governmental bureau. But it can be met through a combined effort by all of us, in and out of government, all trying to develop the necessary understanding that every international problem is in reality a human one. You, the fortunate graduates of this great institution, are in a particularly advantageous position to lead in the development of this kind of thinking and understanding.

You owe it to yourselves and to your country to continue your study and critical analysis of the great international questions of our day. You can join with like-minded men and women in the many voluntary associations that promote people-to-people contact around the world. By means of them, the thorny problems of the time are scrutinized from many viewpoints. Solutions are approached by many avenues. Creative thinking is sparked. Mutual understanding is furthered.

Thus, every thinking person will come to understand that his country's future will be brighter as the lot of mankind improves; that no nation can

in the long run prosper except as the world enjoys a growing prosperity. We must indeed be partners for peace and freedom and prosperity if those words are to record achievement as well as to express a dream.

The foreign policy of this Republic, if it serves the enduring purposes and good of the United States, must always be founded on these truths, thus expressing the enlightened interests of the whole American people. Certainly the basic foreign relations measures taken by the United States in this century have been so developed. They do not belong to any political party—they are American. These measures range from our support of the Organization of American States to our membership in the United Nations and our present programs of partnership and assistance.

The United Nations by its very comprehensiveness is a unique association within which nations of every political complexion and philosophy have their place. The smaller groupings in which we hold membership are bound together by a respect for common values and principles. They conform, of course, to the U.N. Charter. But in each organization the likeness in background or interest or purpose that characterizes the membership and the restricted geographical limits within which it operates assures more effective discharge of their functions than is possible in a group as large as the U.N.

We shall continue in our loyalty to the United Nations. But we should, at the same time, further expand and strengthen our other international associations.

Some of them, although only a few years old, are already household words, recognized as immense contributions to the prosperity and the security of particular areas in the free world—and to our own prosperity and security. Yet none provides a complete answer to any of our international problems. Again, consider NATO.

A united Western Europe may still be on the far-off horizon. NATO is nevertheless a great alliance, rich in human and natural resources. But this great array is neither self-sustaining nor self-sufficient. Its freedom and prosperity and security are intertwined with the freedom and prosperity and security of many other nations—old and new and still to be born—that people an even greater portion of the earth. Within this community of freedom, all are more sure of their

² BULLETIN of May 21, 1956, p. 836.

independence and prosperity and security when all join so that:

- Mutual trade is fostered.
- Legitimate political and economic aspirations are advanced.
- Cultural traditions are respected.
- The difficulties and misfortunes of the weaker are met by help from the stronger. To be backward or pennywise in our practice of this truth can lead only to greater risk and greater cost—far greater cost to ourselves.

Helping To Build Educational Facilities

The ways in which progress along these four roads can be achieved are legion in number. The first, of which I've spoken at some length, is the need for the growth and spread of understanding among our own people. The next is that the peoples of other nations must, through similar study and thought, recognize with us the need for this kind of cooperation.

This, in itself, is not easy. Many nations, though their cultures are ancient and rich in human values, do not possess the resources to spread the needed education throughout their populations. But they can wisely use help that respects their traditions and ways. For example, the whole free world would be stronger if there existed adequate institutions of modern techniques and sciences in areas of the world where the hunger for knowledge and the ability to use knowledge are unsatisfied because educational facilities are often not equal to the existing need.

Do we not find here a worthy challenge to America's universities and to their graduates? I firmly believe that, if some or all of our great universities, strongly supported by private foundations that exist in number throughout our land, sparked by the zeal and fire of educated Americans, would devote themselves to this task, the prospects for a peaceful and prosperous world would be mightily enhanced.

In no respect should the purpose of these institutions be to transplant into a new area the attitudes, the forms, the procedures of America. The staffing, the conduct, the curriculum of each school would be the responsibility of the people where the school might be built.

Each school would help each nation develop its human and natural resources and also provide a

great two-way avenue of communication. We would gain new knowledge and wisdom out of the priceless values of another people's traditions and proud heritage. They would gain knowledge in the technical and scientific fields where we have had an earlier start.

Such a voluntary effort in people-to-people partnership would be a dynamic, a fruitful corollary to three elements already effectively at work in our governmental foreign policy:

- To our atoms-for-peace program.
- To our efforts to establish a climate in which universal disarmament can go forward.
- To our long-sustained campaign for the exchange of knowledge and factual information between peoples.

Purposes and projects such as these, formulated by Republicans and Democrats, are parts of a comprehensive effort to meet present and future needs, to solve problems in the enlightened self-interest of the United States. It takes into account our global concerns on all the continents, on all the oceans.

It is not a haphazard, makeshift arrangement to meet day-to-day crises—big or little or imaginary. Instead, it is a platform for the development of a stable, prosperous, peaceful world. Immediately concerned with this year and next year, our foreign policy is a realistic approach to a better world for all in 1966, 1976, and 1996.

Community of Interest

The basic policy objectives I have described are in furtherance of the aspirations of those who founded the Republic. These objectives are plainly advanced if we foster and secure conditions at home and abroad with which this system of freedom can live and under which it can find fertile ground for acceptance and growth. Thus our security and our aspirations are linked with the security and aspirations of liberty-loving people in many other lands. It is idle to talk of community of interest with them in measures for defense without recognizing community of interest with them in that which is to be defended.

Security cannot be achieved by arms alone, no matter how destructive the weapons or how large their accumulation.

So today it is vitally important that we and others detect and pursue the ways in which cultural and economic assistance will mean more to

free-world strength, stability, and solidarity than will purely military measures.

You of this class, like all Americans, must act in terms of today. At the same time, you in particular should think in terms of those years that now seem so distant.

Increasingly, from this day onward, the influence of men and women now of your age will mold our course at home and abroad. It is logical that you should start immediately thinking about the Republic and the world that stretches out ahead. Then you can start working now for the sort of country and world you want as a home for your children and grandchildren.

You have in your heritage the dynamic principles that arouse visions in mankind. You have in your hearts and minds the means to lift the eyes of men and women above the drab and desolate horizon of hate and fear and hopelessness.

For, my friends of Baylor, as Texans, as Americans, believing as you do in the brotherhood of man and in his right to freedom—joined with all the millions of dedicated men and women at home, linked in partnership with hundreds of millions of like-minded people around the globe—you constitute the mightiest temporal force on earth.

Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference

Press release 272 dated May 22

Secretary Dulles: I have no initial statement of my own to make, so I will be glad to receive your questions.

Q. Mr. Secretary, can you give us your reaction to Egypt's recognition of Red China?

A. It was an action that we regret. That is the only comment I care to make.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you believe that will improve Red China's chances of getting into the United Nations at the next meeting?

A. Not appreciably.

Q. What is the status, Mr. Secretary, of the Aswan Dam?

A. Well, the status is about as previously reported here, except that the Egyptian Government has, I think, sought to work out some arrangement

with the Sudan with reference to the division of the Nile waters before planning to proceed actually with work or expenditures of its own; and that is the present status of that.

Q. Mr. Secretary, will the United States be willing to put any money into that project if the Egyptians accept aid from the Soviets?

A. You say "if"?

Q. There have been a lot of stories out of Egypt saying Colonel Nasser possibly will accept Russian Communist help in building the dam. Would that automatically exclude or end our offers to participate, or would we be willing to join in something which the Communists might be interested in?

A. That is rather a hypothetical question, but I would say it would be unlikely, I think, that we would find it practical or desirable to engage at this time in a cooperative effort of this type with the Soviet Union.

Soviet Armed Forces

Q. Mr. Secretary, at your last press conference you gave us as reasons for the Russians cutting down their military manpower as based on internal and economic grounds.¹ A few hours later Secretary Wilson said they were just readjusting their forces to nuclear warfare, the same way we were, and on Friday, I think, the Presidential assistant, Mr. Stassen, said that it was a response to our policy. None of these factors exclude the other. I was wondering if you could put this in perspective for us.

A. I think it should first perhaps be made clear that there was no disclosure at London by the Soviets of their intention to reduce their armed forces. The conclusion was drawn in London, as well as here, that because of the various factors, particularly their economic situation and the general trend toward emphasizing modern weapons more than men, there would likely be a reduction of Soviet army manpower. That was a matter of deduction and not of disclosure.

Now, since the action was taken unilaterally, without any prior disclosure to the Disarmament Subcommittee, it is necessarily speculative as to why they did it. And when you get into people's motivations it is always a difficult thing to be clear about it, particularly when it is the motivation of

¹ BULLETIN of May 28, 1956, p. 880.

people like the Soviet rulers, whose motivations are not influenced by public-opinion considerations or parliamentary considerations. Now, it is, broadly speaking, the view, I think, of the administration that the action taken was primarily responsive to the two factors alluded to: namely, first, the economic pressures that the Soviet Union is under, particularly the need of greater manpower in agriculture and in industry, and, secondly, the fact that the modern trend, as evidenced by our own action, is to put more emphasis upon modern weapons and less emphasis upon the number of men under arms.

The United States, as I think I pointed out last week, has itself made a considerable aggregate reduction in the numbers of men under arms. We have not claimed that that was done as a contribution toward disarmament or because we wanted to weaken ourselves; indeed, we have felt that we were stronger as a result of our shifts. They did not involve any diminution in our military power, and we have no reason to believe that the action announced by the Soviet Union will result in a diminution of its military power. Furthermore, there is no system of supervision or verification. We don't really know what will go on and whether in fact there will be even the shift of manpower away from armies that has been forecast.

Now it may be that they also intended, and probably hoped, to set in motion a movement toward reduction of armaments in the Western countries. Perhaps they hoped for a reduction in armaments which in other cases would actually mean a diminution of military strength. Perhaps they also had in mind the possible impact of what they did on the situation in the Federal Republic of Germany, where legislation is before the Parliament dealing with the question of the establishment of the military forces of the Federal Republic and the length of their service.

As I say, one can speculate almost indefinitely as to the motivations that may have been back of the announcement. It is impossible to be certain about that. I think, however, that it is the safest thing to assume that the motivations were primarily of two sources: namely, the trend in all modern countries which make these new weapons to put more emphasis upon that than upon actual manpower and, secondly, the economic needs of their agriculture and industry at the present time; and perhaps in the third place the desire to make gains on the propaganda front and in terms of bringing

about actual disarmament on the part of the Western countries, which they naturally would like to see.

Q. Mr. Secretary, to clarify a point, if I may, on that same subject, it has been published—and I think not until now denied—that Mr. Stassen was told by Khrushchev at his meeting in London that they were indeed going to reduce their armed forces, but it isn't clear whether there was any figure involved, and Mr. Stassen reported this to be true. Now, what you're saying, is that contradicting that? Is that not true?

A. I checked back with Mr. Stassen yesterday. He was in St. Paul. He said to me that their conclusions were from deductions and not disclosure.

Japanese Textiles

Q. Mr. Secretary, the American textile industry has been pushing to obtain some sort of limitation of Japanese imports for some time. Recently, instead of a negotiated agreement, they asked for and received an exchange of notes between the United States Government and the Japanese Embassy on Japanese exports, with a promise that they would get some sort of an export subsidy program, and another promise that they would try to persuade other countries to buy more textiles from Japan to ease the pressure in Japan for export of textiles here.² Can this be interpreted as being a limit to the action which the administration will take in regard to Japanese textiles?

A. No, I would not say so. The administration has its normal duties under the law to give domestic industries protection against imports which seriously endanger or jeopardize an industry. It is always preferable to see that necessary protec-

² In an exchange of notes with the United States on May 16 (not printed), the Japanese Embassy at Washington described the nature of Japanese voluntary textile-export controls and set forth the Japanese intention to continue into 1957 the controls in effect in 1956 and to give 3 months' advance notice of any future increase in export quantities.

On May 21 the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced that, as of Aug. 1, 1956, it would extend the price benefits of its raw-cotton export program, announced on Feb. 28, to cover exports of cotton textiles, cotton yarns, and spinnable cotton waste. Under the export program, Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of upland cotton are made available for sale for export on a competitive bid basis.

tion of American industries brought about by a voluntary action on the part of the nations which are exporting to the United States; that is, it is preferable to do it that way than by unilateral protective action by the United States. But certainly the United States has not forgone its intention, indeed its duty, to take any action that may be called for by the facts. I do not myself know whether the facts are such that that action has been invoked. I don't think it has been invoked as yet by the textile industry. But they are always free to do so.

Q. Mr. Secretary, are you aware of any developments which will indicate whether the Soviets meant business when they spoke about cooperation and relaxing tensions in the Middle East? What would be the price of their cooperation in such an effort?

A. Well, there has been no effort that I am aware of to test that in terms of any specific action. There probably will be a resolution of some sort proposed in the Security Council which would be a followup of the first resolution,³ which was the United States proposal, pursuant to which Mr. Hammarskjold went out to the Near East. I think that is being informally discussed at the present time. And it may be that that followup resolution will afford testing or an opportunity to know more clearly what it is that the Soviets had in mind by their statement.

Q. Mr. Secretary, would the United States Government like to see Mr. Hammarskjold return to the Middle East to carry on—I believe the words you used in your speech at one point—the momentum which he has already achieved?

A. Well, we think it's very important that the momentum should be maintained. We are not clear whether that requires or would be well served by Mr. Hammarskjold himself going back at this particular time. I believe that Mr. Hammarskjold has some doubts as to whether that is the best action to take at the moment. I think he is following up a number of aspects of his work there by communication from time to time with the Heads of the Governments or with the Foreign Ministers concerned. You see, there is a good bit still to be done to implement the agreements that were actually made, particularly in terms of giv-

ing mobility, freedom of movement, to the armistice teams, and things of that sort. Those things are still being worked out and, I understand, are being actively followed up by Mr. Hammarskjold from this country, and we are not yet clear that the stage has been reached where Mr. Hammarskjold ought to turn and go right back again. Perhaps not.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in your conference Saturday with Japanese Minister Kono,⁴ were you able to determine that the Soviet Union has established any new policy or made any new offers toward Japan leading to peaceful relations, and also will the United States help Japan make up this fishing deficit?

A. I don't think that the United States will have to do anything affirmative to help, as you put it, to make up the deficit. I think that there are fishing areas which are available to the Japanese, and it would not be necessary to alter, I would think, the terms of our fishing treaty with Japan, the trilateral treaty to which Canada, the United States, and Japan are parties.⁵ That treaty, you may recall, was negotiated at the same time that I was negotiating the Japanese Peace Treaty, and I had some part in the negotiations of that fishing agreement also. Now, as far as the Soviet attitude toward Japan is concerned, I think that they still want to reestablish more normal relations with Japan, but the terms and conditions under which that might take place I couldn't report on here. That is a matter primarily for consideration between the Japanese Government and the Soviet Government.

Q. Mr. Secretary, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in voting on the foreign aid bill, has

⁴ In a statement to correspondents on May 19, Lincoln White, Acting Chief of the News Division, said: "The Japanese Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, Mr. Ichiro Kono, visited Washington on May 19 on his way home to Tokyo from the Soviet Union. He described to senior officers of the Department of State the fisheries agreements he has just concluded with the Soviet Union in Moscow. State Department officials expressed their appreciation to Mr. Kono for his courtesy in coming to Washington to convey this information. . . . Mr. Kono was received informally by the Secretary of State . . . [and] discussed with the Secretary matters concerning the strengthening of friendly relations between the United States and Japan."

⁵ BULLETIN of Mar. 3, 1952, p. 340, and May 26, 1952, p. 830.

³ BULLETIN of Apr. 16, 1956, p. 628.

rejected a specific long-term aid commitment and voted a general statement of policy to continue aid as long as the Communist threat persists. Would you tell us whether this meets your and the administration's hopes or falls short of it?

A. I would say that, on net balance, this provisional action fell short of our hopes. Of course, the bill has not yet been finally reported out of the committee, and I think it is premature for me to make assumptions regarding the bill until it is finally reported out, because, as we all know, changes are often made at the last minute and positions are sometimes reversed. But we welcome very much the statement of policy in the so-called Richards amendment, which seems to us to be a very straightforward and sane statement that, as long as there is danger from the Soviet-bloc countries, we will take reasonable measures to meet that danger, including measures to strengthen the position of the free world abroad as well as at home. Now, it does not meet our hope for an indication of congressional approval of specific projects which we had asked for, and we intend to continue to seek that authority when the matter comes up for further consideration perhaps by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Q. Mr. Secretary, did President Sukarno, when he was in Washington, seek from you any statement by this Government on behalf of their position on West New Guinea, and if so what was your reply?

A. As far as I am aware, President Sukarno did not personally bring that matter up. It was raised in a talk which I had with the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Indonesia. The Foreign Minister repeated his well-known hope that the United States would support the Indonesian position with reference to West Irian. I indicated the reasons why we did not feel in a position to support affirmatively their position, and the situation, I would say, was left much as it was before the visit in that respect.

U.S.-Egyptian Relations

Q. Mr. Secretary, have you received any information that would tend to either confirm or discredit the rumor out of Cairo that Communist China might supply arms to Egypt?

A. No, we had no information about that, other than what is in the newspaper accounts.

Q. Still on the subject of Egypt, Mr. Secretary, it has been widely reported that the State Department originally was quite enthusiastic about Mr. Nasser but has taken a much more bearish view of him recently. Your indications in answer to questions this morning—were you wanting to infer that that bearishness is intensified? Is that true? Can you clarify it a little more?

A. Well, I expressed a regret of his action extending recognition to Communist China. I have also indicated that we are sympathetic with whatever action he reasonably takes to emphasize the genuine independence of Egypt, and, to the extent that he is a spokesman for Egyptian independence, we have sympathy with his point of view. But to the extent that he takes action which seems to promote the interests of the Soviet Union and Communist China, we do not look with favor upon such action.

Q. Mr. Secretary, when you spoke about the unlikelihood of the United States making a cooperative effort with the Soviet Union in building the Aswan Dam, is that an implication there that the United States also might take another look at economic and technical aid to countries in Asia which are accepting similar aid and offers from Russia?

A. No, the question, as I understood it at least, posed the question whether we are willing to cooperate with the Soviet Union on a specific project. That is something quite different from our assisting on one project, while the country in question is obtaining assistance from the Soviet Union with respect to some other project.

Presidents' Meeting in Panama

Q. Mr. Secretary, can you tell us about the administration's viewpoint toward this meeting in Panama of the Presidents, and whether you propose to go?*

A. The meeting is one which was initiated, as you know, by the Government of Panama to celebrate the first Pan American meeting [in 1826], which was called on the initiative of Bolívar. We believe that the developments of unity within the American States which have occurred since that time are tremendously important. They constitute in some respects an example to other areas of the

* BULLETIN of May 28, 1956, p. 880.

world, and it is deserving that an occasion like this should be given importance. It does indicate the ability of the Republics of this hemisphere to work together through the Organization of American States in a way which is, I think, of great benefit to them; it enables them to settle disputes between themselves and to create a solidarity as against external threats. It is undoubtedly not only the oldest but the best organized regional association that there is in the whole world, and the opportunity to bring that more to the attention of the world is an opportunity which the President thought was so important that he was willing to accept the invitation from the Republic of Panama and to go to the area.

I think it is likely that I will accompany the President, although there has been no firm decision on that. I normally do go with the President when he makes foreign visits of this character.

Q. Within the week it has been said that the cuts that the Russians propose to make in their armed forces reflected an initiative in the direction in which we want the Russians to go. Would you care to discuss that? Some of your statements seem to be a little at variance with that.

A. No, I prefer not to discuss that particular statement. I think I have already adequately stated my views on the announced reduction of men in arms by the Soviet Union. Perhaps that statement of mine had better stand on its own footing.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in the past few days there have been a few developments that have come out on the Near East. I wonder if you could comment on them. One is the trip by the Egyptian correspondent to the Israeli Government and the subsequent permission by the Egyptian Government to publish his dispatches, and secondly, last night a commentator on the Cairo radio stated that he believed that peace was possible between Israel and Egypt. I wonder if you can comment on those two developments.

A. Well, I think both of the developments to which you refer are encouraging, and the United States is very happy that those events can occur—the trip and the announcement that was made. We are not in a very good position ourselves to evaluate these developments, particularly the last one to which you refer. But if there is any kind of rapprochement there between the Israelis and

the Arabs in terms of making the settlement more durable and secure, that of course is in line with the United States policy.

Q. Mr. Secretary, would the followup resolution in the Security Council about which you spoke have to do with the armistice itself or going the next step, to the problem of peace?

A. I do not feel at liberty to discuss that, because it is being actively discussed at the present time between the various members of the Security Council in New York and on an informal basis. There has been no crystallization of thinking of just what should be in the resolution, nor, so far as I am aware, have Mr. Hammarskjöld's definitive views been yet obtained. So I think it would be premature to conjecture about what the resolution would contain, because all the elements that would contribute to our thinking on that subject are not known.

Trade With Communist China

Q. Mr. Secretary, Mr. Anthony Nutting said in Parliament about a week ago that the British Government intended to make use of the exception clause of the restricted list in trade with Red China under the embargo agreement.⁷ Can you say whether the British Government's attitude on this point is a result of consultations with the United States, and what your feeling about this is?

A. Well, that topic was discussed somewhat by Mr. Selwyn Lloyd and myself when we were in Paris in connection with the NATO ministerial meeting.⁸ The British Government through him did indicate an intention to use perhaps somewhat more freely the so-called "exception" procedure which has always been in the CHINCOM⁹ multi-

⁷ As spokesman for the British Government, Mr. Nutting on May 14 replied to a question in the House of Commons concerning Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd's talks with Secretary Dulles by stating that the discussions were not yet concluded; "in the meantime, however, more use will be made of the exceptions procedure to permit reasonable exports in appropriate cases to China of goods which are not on the Soviet list."

⁸ See also the joint statement issued on Feb. 1 following Sir Anthony Eden's talks with President Eisenhower (BULLETIN of Feb. 13, 1956, p. 232).

⁹ The China Committee, which coordinates international security controls over trade with Communist China. For background on strategic trade controls, including a chart of the international organization, see BULLETIN of Dec. 5, 1955, p. 918.

lateral understandings. We do not know what the practical impact of that will be because, until we know what may be the items or the quantities to which this "exception" procedure would be so extended, we can't judge what it means. We do not now have to conclude that it will lead to a general breakdown of the multilateral structure for controlling and checking trade.

You see, in any event, this applies only to items which are not on the so-called CoCom [Coordinating Committee] list—that is, the limitations on the trade with the Soviet Union—but only upon items which are not deemed strategic as far as the Soviet Union is concerned but are still nevertheless on the China list. So it will relate presumably to some of those items which are on the China list but not on the Soviet list. This implies at least that the items are not regarded as high in strategic value, or else they would be on the Soviet list, and they are items which are always procurable through the Soviet Union. It could buy them and ship them to Communist China. That involves certain delay, certain additional expense. It involves questions of the availability of space on the roads and the railroads. There is a moral factor. So, the CHINCOM list is regarded by us as highly significant. But the items themselves are not considered of prime importance as regards strategic value or else they would be on the CoCom list.

Q. Mr. Secretary, I would like to ask—I understand that at a reception in Moscow last night Khrushchev told Ambassador Bohlen that he, Khrushchev, told Mr. Stassen in London that the Soviet Union would reduce its armed forces. Is that a lie?

A. Well, I have already said enough on that subject to indicate my view of what Khrushchev reportedly said. I repeat that there was no disclosure and that the conclusions drawn were deductions.

Q. Mr. Secretary, weren't the deductions strong enough so that you established an interdepartmental subcommittee in the Government to study what the reaction of this Government ought to be?

A. Yes, we thought it highly probable that there would be a reduction coming along. We felt that, however, not by any means exclusively as a result of anything that was learned in the talks

in London. There were a number of indications from a good many quarters. I repeat again that there was no disclosure by the Soviets at London of what they intended to do. They were deductions drawn.

Q. Mr. Secretary, when you spoke about the import restrictions from Japan, you mentioned the normal duties under the law. I presume by that you meant the escape-clause procedures?

A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Secretary, are we going to Panama purely for symbolic reasons, or do you think the President will have some concrete offer to make, some proposal to make to the meeting?

A. No, we do not anticipate that the meeting at Panama will deal with any of what I call items of business. It is more than symbolic, because the importance attached to a meeting of the American States at that place, on that particular date, and with the attendance that will be there, will certainly give an important lift to the whole concept of the Organization of the American Republics.

NATO and the Atlantic Community

Q. Mr. Secretary, there has been discussion for many months now that perhaps in the expanded role of NATO and its new position that you are now evaluating, that perhaps in cases like Cyprus that NATO might assume jurisdiction there. Would you say such a move there as this is envisaged in the expanded NATO?

A. Well, that is undoubtedly one of the problems that will be considered by this ministerial committee that is studying this question, that is, whether or not the Atlantic Community should develop more in terms of a regional association and should attempt to settle differences as between its members through some regional process or not. You see, at the present time NATO is not set up as a regional association under the United Nations Charter. It is set up as a collective defense association under article 51.

Now, the charter does encourage the development of regional associations, and it also encourages the settlement of disputes "in the first instance," as it puts it, by various means of the parties' own choosing, including, among other things, by the settlement through regional processes. Now so far, as I say, NATO has not been

organized as a regional association, nor has it any policy or jurisdiction to deal with disputes as between the members. One of the matters which will doubtless be considered in evaluating the desirable evolutionary steps to be taken at this time would be that question of whether or not to make it more of a regional association with a responsibility to settle differences between its members.

Q. Mr. Secretary, insofar as the Cyprus question is a matter between governments, has the United States ever offered to mediate or play a role; I mean as between Turkey and Greece and Britain?

A. No, we have never offered to, nor have we been invited to.

Q. Mr. Secretary, I believe the United States has always been opposed to the maintenance of political standing groups in NATO as opposed to military groups. Is there any change in that position?

A. Well, the question of whether we make the Atlantic Community, through NATO or otherwise, into a body of greater political importance is one of the matters that is being considered. So far there has been no decision by any of the governments concerned to do that. So far, it has been operated primarily as a military alliance, and, while there have been reports from time to time on political matters, those have been primarily for the purpose of keeping the other Ministers informed on matters of interest rather than on the basis of the common duty, you might say, to seek to arrive at a common position on these matters. We are quite prepared to consider, with an open mind and with the other countries, an evolutionary step which would place greater political responsibility upon representatives of the NATO or the Atlantic Community countries.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you draw a distinction between NATO and the Atlantic Community when you or the President use those terms? And, if so, what is it, in your mind?

A. There is a difference, I think, in this respect, that NATO is technically a creature of a treaty and that treaty is primarily a military alliance. As far as the treaty itself goes, the provisions of, let's say, article 2 and article 4, which are the two articles which deal with nonmilitary topics, those provisions are rather narrow and rather sketchy.

And it may very well be that, if these broader aspects are to be developed, they could be developed through steps which were additional to, or you might say superimposed upon, the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty. I do not think we need to be limited by the terms of the treaty, because there is within the President an authority to conduct foreign relations, and to negotiate, through persons and by means that he chooses. If he chooses to conduct foreign relations through persons who at the same time are members of the NATO Council, he can do so. In other words, they would in a sense be wearing two hats.

Q. Mr. Secretary, can you give us your reaction to Russia's reported offer to let Pan American Airways fly into Moscow?

A. Well, the United States has for many years sought for our air companies an opportunity to fly into Russia, and if that facility is to be accorded we would welcome it.

Q. Wouldn't that necessitate our giving them some privileges, such as flying the Atlantic, which might have some military value in training their people?

A. Well, so far there has been no suggestion that this would have to be on a reciprocity basis.

Q. Thank you very much.

Anniversary of the Founding of Buddhism

Statement by Secretary Dulles

Press release 279 dated May 24

The 2,500th anniversary of the founding of Buddhism is being celebrated this year throughout the world. The Sixth Buddhist Synod has reached its culmination in Rangoon, Burma. I should like to take this opportunity to express the importance which our Nation attaches to the recognition of the moral and spiritual values which alone can give significance to our lives and which must be the basis on which will be built the world of peace and justice which we all seek. We feel a sense of brotherhood with all peoples who adhere to such principles and welcome all occasions on which their essential importance is reaffirmed.

Visit of President Sukarno of Indonesia

Following are texts of remarks made on the arrival at Washington on May 16 of President Sukarno of the Republic of Indonesia, together with the two major addresses made by President Sukarno during his 3-day State visit in Washington.

WELCOME AT NATIONAL AIRPORT, MAY 16

Press release 262 dated May 16

Statement by Vice President Nixon

Mr. President, it is a very great privilege to welcome you to the United States on behalf of President Eisenhower, the Government of the United States, and all of the people of our country. I recall the very warm welcome that I received on the occasion of my visit to your country 2½ years ago. I can assure you that every place you go in the United States you will receive the same kind of welcome here because you, like our own George Washington, led your people to independence from colonialism and now in peace lead the Government of your country and the people to even greater achievements.

We trust that your visit every place will be one that will be of interest to you. We know that your conversations with President Eisenhower, the Secretary of State, and other Government officials will serve to strengthen the bonds of friendship between our two peoples.

Response by President Sukarno

Mr. Vice President, I am very happy to be in Washington today. I am very grateful for the invitation President Eisenhower and the American Government rendered to me. I am also very grateful for the kind reception.

I have come to America to see your country with my own eyes. I have come here to observe the great achievements of the great American Nation. I have come here to confirm or to modify the im-

pressions of your country which I have collected for so many years. Above all, I have come here to America to learn something from America—not in the first place from America merely as a country, merely as a nation, merely as a people, but from America as a state of mind, from America as the center of an idea.

I carry with me the greetings of the Indonesian people to you. I carry with me the thanks of the Indonesian people to you for all the assistance you gave us in our national reconstruction. I hope this visit will lead to a real understanding and to a real friendship between the American Nation and the Indonesian nation.

Thank you.

REMARKS AT WHITE HOUSE LUNCHEON, MAY 16

White House press release dated May 16

President Eisenhower

We are gathered here, of course, to do our part in extending to the President of Indonesia and his party a welcome to this land.

Mr. President, gathered here are many members of the executive branch of our Government, the Chief Justice of the United States, distinguished members of the United States Senate and of the United States House of Representatives, as well as representatives of our industrial and educational life. This representative body, I assure you, expresses the thought of America in saying to you: You are truly welcome and we hope you have a wonderful time in this country.

There are, of course, some parallels between your country and ours. Both of us were colonies. And both of us in our early years of freedom had some difficult problems to solve.

It happens that when we were in our 11th year of independence, as you are now, the man whose portrait is on the far wall over there—John

Adams—was President. One of the stories told about John Adams in this house—he was the first man to live in this house—was that his wife, Abigail, hung her laundry, done by her own hands, in the East Room, where we shall have coffee.

I tell this little story merely to show that in our time, in our 11th year, we were going through a period where it was indeed difficult going. But we had friends on the earth, as you have. And I think it is to the credit of the human race that when they see an individual or a nation working or struggling to go higher in life so that men may realize more of their material and spiritual ambitions, there is always somebody ready to help them. Of course, there's always someone ready to step in our faces, too, but I think friendship is stronger than the jealousies and the hatreds.

At least this is my hope: during your visit here in America you find much of interest that you can carry back and possibly even apply—or find some adaptation—to your own country. Above all, we hope—all of us here—that you will carry back with you a sense that the American people are truly interested in Indonesia and you and your efforts to raise the standards of all your people, to make for them a better life.

Gentlemen, would you rise with me and drink a toast to President Sukarno, the President of Indonesia.

President Sukarno

Mr. President, gentlemen, twice today I have expressed my admiration for the great American Nation, and I hope to have still more opportunities not only during this visit of mine but in my whole life to express again and again my admiration for the great American people.

This lunch, which I feel as an honor rendered to me, gives me an opportunity to express my admiration—my great admiration—for your great President, President Eisenhower.

May I ask you to rise and to join me in drinking a toast to the health of President Eisenhower.

ADDRESS TO THE CONGRESS, MAY 17¹

Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, I deem it a great honor and privilege to be able to address

¹Made before a joint meeting of the Senate and the House of Representatives; reprinted from *Cong. Rec.* of May 17, 1956, p. 7524.

this honorable Congress, and I express my gratitude to you for this opportunity.

Standing here before you, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, and before all the other honorable Members of this Congress, my thoughts, the thoughts of a man born in a cottage and grown up among poor people, go to the homes and hearts of the multitudes of the American people from all strata of your society, for whom you act as elected representatives. May I, therefore, convey to you, and through you to the people of America, the most sincere greetings of the Indonesian people and their thanks for your past generous assistance, with the hope that this visit to the United States of America will foster closer relations between our two nations.

In our contemporary world, the impact of America is felt more and more. The influence of the American with his outlook, his ideas, his technical and scientific advances, reaches to almost every corner of Asia and Africa, whilst in America itself, Asia, the Asian and his personality, his ideals, the fruits of his labor, are gradually becoming a living reality. Americans and Indonesians are no longer strangers to each other. We know each other from the films; the beams of the radio reach into our very homes; and the magazines and daily press provoke us to think of each other. These cultural exchanges, coupled with the products of your industries and the fruits of our soil, have kept us always much closer together than the thousands of sea miles which separate our two countries.

I have come to the United States, as I said yesterday, to see your country with my own eyes and to observe the achievements of the great American Nation. I have come here to confirm or to modify the impressions of your country which I have collected from a distance over many years. But, above all, I have come here to learn something from America—from America not merely as a place, not merely as a nation, but America as a state of mind, America as the center of an idea.

It was this very America which was in fact the first product of nationalism, of anticolonialism, and of the principle of independence. It is this America which, as the hothouse of American technology, surpassed the development of older sister nations and became a great power—nay, one of the most powerful nations in the world today. Present-day America as a world phenomenon, with all its impact on the peoples of the earth, was the

child of a marriage between the revolutionary America of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln and the technological America imbued with the prodigious technical spirit of Edison and Ford.

The shot that was fired at Lexington on the 19th of April 1775 was heard around the world. It echoes still in the hearts of all who have recently won their independence, and it echoes still in the hearts of peoples who still struggle against their colonial bonds.

Over half the world the burning words which fired the American War of Independence have been closely studied as a source of inspiration and a plan of action. Yes, this period is the period of Asian and African resurgence.

If we could see the passage of history as yesterday I saw your country from the windows of an aeroplane, we could have no doubt that the world is passing through the period of Asian and African nationalism.

"Nationalism"

I hesitate at using that word "nationalism," for I know that in many countries and in many nations nationalism is an out-of-date political doctrine. Please remember, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, that for us of Asia and Africa nationalism is a young and progressive creed. We do not equate nationalism with chauvinism, and we do not interpret nationalism as meaning the superiority of our peoples over others. No. For us, nationalism means the rebuilding of our nations; it means the effort to provide equal esteem for our peoples; it means the determination to take the future into our own hands. For us, nationalism is the love of country and the determination to improve it which, not so very long ago, illumined the actions of the founders of your Nation. Nationalism may be an out-of-date doctrine for many in this world; for us of Asia and Africa, it is the mainspring of our efforts. Understand that, and you have the key to much of postwar history. Fail to understand it, and no amount of thinking, no torrent of words, and no Niagara of dollars will produce anything but bitterness and disillusionment.

We who are living in Asia and Africa during this period of Asian and African nationalism, and particularly those of us who have been called upon to guide the destiny of nations—we ask that the rest of the world should show understanding and sympathy. After all, for what do we strug-

gle? Not for fame; not for conquests; not for territorial aggrandizement; not for domination over other peoples. Our efforts and the sacrifices we have made have been for the release of our people from a colonial tyranny lasting for generations and centuries. It has been a struggle—it is still a struggle—for the simple human demands which the rest of the world has long taken for granted.

We ask you to understand our national struggle, and we ask you to sympathize with it. We ask you to understand and sympathize with the fact that our national struggle is still incomplete. How can it be complete when millions of our people in Asia and Africa are still under colonial domination, are still not free? How can the national struggle in Indonesia be complete when part of our own country and part of our own nation are still unfree?

I recall with the very greatest pleasure that shortly after the first Asian-African Conference last year, this Congress unanimously approved a resolution reaffirming America's traditional anti-colonial attitude. That conference in Bandung, in which the leaders of 29 states took part, and which represented far more than half the population of the world, was a clear indication of history's direction. Practically all shades of the political spectrum were represented there, and almost all were but recently emancipated from colonialism. They were united by many things but chiefly by their abhorrence of colonialism. They produced a declaration which explicitly stated their continuing opposition to colonialism in all its forms. This Congress, noting that conference and its declaration, then unanimously restated, for all the world to know, its own longstanding opposition to colonialism. By that action, this Congress demonstrated its sympathy with our efforts. In the scales of history, your weight was placed resoundingly onto the side of the future.

Indonesian Independence

It is now almost 11 years since, on the 17th of August 1945, the Indonesian people proclaimed themselves independent. Note: I said the Indonesian people. Not those of Java alone, nor Sumatra alone, nor Celebes alone, but all of them, from the north of Sumatra to the southernmost corner of West New Guinea, which we call Irian Barat.

That Declaration of Independence covered every

part of what was once called the Netherlands East Indies, which constituted the vast colonial empire in Asia of a small European country. We had no quarrel with the Dutch as a people; we had no quarrel with the Government of the Netherlands as a government. Our quarrel, and the quarrel of our forefathers, was with colonialism: we had a quarrel with the colonial attitudes of some Dutch people; we had a quarrel with the colonial attitudes and actions of the Netherlands Government.

Four and a half years of fighting and negotiation followed. Four and a half years in which our colonially impoverished country, suffering already from the torments of Japanese occupation, suffered more from the attempts forcibly to reimpose the colonialism we had rejected. Finally, due in no small part to the efforts of the United Nations and its bodies in which America was prominent, the Netherlands made formal recognition of complete and unconditional sovereignty to Indonesia.

But our struggle was not yet at an end. One part of our country, one section of our brothers, were not free—and even today are not free. The territory of Irian Barat, West New Guinea, is still a colonial outpost on Indonesian soil. Our Declaration of Independence had covered all of the Netherlands East Indies. The agreements by which Holland recognized that independence and that sovereignty had made reference to the whole territory of the Netherlands East Indies. But part of our land, a part of the territories covered by those agreements, is still a colonial cancer in the body politic of our motherland.

We are told that the people of West Irian are not our brothers and that they come from a different racial stock and therefore West Irian is not Indonesian. Where—again, where—is the country whose citizens are ethnically pure? In fact, for many hundreds of years past, West Irian has been recognized as being part of the Indonesian archipelago. Before colonial days, West Irian was part of the Indonesian national state of Modjopahit, one of the glories of the Hindu-Javanese civilization. West Irian was part of the Dutch Empire in Asia and was administered and recognized without question as being a unit of the Netherlands East Indies. In all ways, and by ties of common colonial experience, West Irian has been, and still is, an essential part of Indonesia.

We are told that the people of West Irian are not ready for a change from their colonial status,

and that they need the continued guidance of the West to train them for the transition to liberty.

We know this "guidance." We have had experience of this "training." It left us, after 350 years, with an illiteracy rate of 94 percent. It left us without sufficient doctors to treat even those who are sick unto death. It left us with a typically colonial economic and social structure.

Progress Since Independence

I tell you this in all solemnity. In the 11 years of our independence, the Indonesian nation has made more human progress, and has been the scene of greater human happiness, than in all the tens of generations of colonialism that went before. Our people are free, and in freedom they have found their soul—just as the people of West Irian will do when they too are free. They can do what we have done. The figures are available: the lists of schools built, of recurrent epidemics abated, of diets improved, of infant mortality decreased. Forgive me if I seem to boast. I do not intend to boast. I wish to give you a factual account. Let me cite just one item in the field of education. Illiteracy before the war was 94 percent; today it is 40 percent. That is what the ending of colonialism will mean in West Irian.

The return of West Irian is for us the remaining part of our national political aspiration. It is the final installment on the colonial debt. We see our brothers still in chains, who joined with us in proclaiming our common independence, and so our own freedom is not yet complete. The salt of liberty cannot have its full savor for us until all of Indonesia is again united under the freedom which is the birthright of all men.

Permit me to remind you, sir, of one of America's greatest sons, who said that this Nation could not exist half slave and half free. That father of the American tradition was not speaking then of colonial slavery, but his words apply in all their moving strength to this case.

Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, although somewhat belatedly, we of Indonesia are now in the stage of national turmoil through which you passed before us some 150 years ago. We are anti-colonialists, for the sweat of our labor has been extorted by other nations, leaving us poverty-stricken with the sorrow of our hearts. We are nationalists, for it is our right to win back the worthy place in the family of nations torn from our forefathers three and a half centuries ago. In all of this, we

do not claim to have discovered novel principles. No, but like your forefathers, we regard our findings as universal values, as the common property of all mankind.

Present-day Indonesia has so much in common with the growth of the United States of America in the past. You are now reaping the fruits of your pioneering struggle, while we are still busy sowing the seeds from which our future national life will spring. You achieved your material and cultural prosperity based upon the principles of the democracy which is one of your proudest boasts today. Democracy is part of our principles too, part of our Pantja Sila, an instrument to build national prosperity and stability. But we Indonesians are well aware that, however noble the aim, practical democracy is not always easily attainable.

First Steps Toward Democracy

Last year we twice faced the test of the free and secret ballot, one of the fundamentals of political democracy. The conduct of these elections, one for the House of Representatives and the other for the Constituent Assembly, showed that Indonesia is capable, as the international press reported, of taking the first steps along the road to democracy. Although the elections are not compulsory, about 80 percent of the electors, numbering some 35 million souls and scattered over thousands of miles in thousands of islands in our great archipelago, came to the polls and fulfilled their duties as responsible citizens. As a result of these elections, it has been possible to form a coalition government between the largest political parties. The PNI (Nationalist Party), the Masjumi and the Nahdatul Ulama (both Moslem parties) with the support of some of the smaller parties, have formed a coalition cabinet. I trust that this coalition, with more than ample support from Parliament, will be stable enough to maintain itself throughout the entire 4 years of its mandate, so that the national process of growth will not be interrupted by intermittent changes of government.

Although these first elections have been successfully accomplished, I shall be modest, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, in my claims for the establishment of democracy. For who has absolute democracy? We have our feet on the road to democracy, and we have made a good start. But we will not deceive ourselves with the false illusion that we have traversed the full extent of the road

to democracy, if indeed any end there be. The secret ballot, the free press, the freedom of belief, the voting in parliaments—these are all merely expressions of democracy. Freedom of expression has a guardian in a certain measure of prosperity, the achievement of freedom from want. For us, then, democratic principles are not simply an aim, the expression of desires inherent in human nature; they are also a means of providing our people with a reasonable standard of living. The freedom of expression and the freedom from want are indivisibles, two interdependent souls in one body. As with all other freedoms, freedom of expression is no absolute; its indiscriminate and unrestrained exercise could hamper the harmonious growth of other freedoms, could hamper the harmonious growth from want, and thus sow the seed for the destruction of the fundamentals of human freedom itself.

Your Nation began your struggle for liberty, equality, fraternity, and prosperity at a period in history when there was no great gap between the standards of nations. There was no great gap between haves and have-nots, there were no nations of abject poverty and extreme wealth, there were no nations of super technical development and utter technical backwardness, there was not so great a gap between the fortunates possessing full-fledged democracy and the sufferers living under complete tyranny. The contrasts today are great. The contrast between the joy of life cherished by some nations and the burden of suffering imposed upon more than one half of the human race has outstripped all proportions. Such conditions do not stimulate normal growth toward emancipation, especially when the less-privileged are subjected to the competition of the privileged and the powerful in their daily human activities. But if the development of the newly independent countries in the direction of their prosperity be regarded as indispensable for the preservation of civilized man, there certainly will be no need for regrets over the world's wealth and the almost unlimited resources for the further development of man's technological civilization.

Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, the impact of your revolution has not always been of the same kind upon all countries of the globe. We in Indonesia attach great importance to the freedom of expression, to be preserved even in the Herculean task of firmly founding our national economy. Other revolutions have aimed immediately upon building heavy industry as the basis for freedom

from want in the future, if necessary even at the sacrifice of some aspects of freedom of expression for the time being. These are rival conceptions, and they constitute a challenge to Indonesia which she must answer in translating ideals into practice.

The development of Indonesia in particular and of certain other countries of Asia in general will be the test case of the success or failure of the modern world's application of democratic principles. The solvency of less technically developed countries, the solution of the social and economic problems of newly independent peoples at a pace which can keep up with their consciousness of their own worth as equal members of the human family—these are all questions to measure the success of our democracy. In Indonesia, apart from the wealth of nature, our main capital is the sweat and tears of our population, the sacrifices even to the death of those who have gone before. It has been, and it still is, an investment of voluntary human co-operation and sacrifice which is needed for the development of our country. There is no imposition upon the people to save part of their meager income as a means of accumulating badly needed national capital, neither would we introduce forced labor for national undertakings, nor the expropriation of existing big companies which are run mainly on the basis of profit motives.

Moreover, the present situation in the world is, as I have already mentioned, such that even we the economically weak nations have to compete in order to grow—compete with the forces of powerful and experienced nations in order to survive the drives and thrusts of the current of elimination. Democracy, when all is said and done, is the introduction of equal opportunity in human activities amongst the indigenous people themselves, and, next to that, some degree of opportunity for foreign competitors to insure the best performance. This sometimes leads toward the presence of an anachronism in which colonial vestiges become strengthened at the expense of national growth. Taking all this into consideration, the question arises: Will democracy succeed in Indonesia? Will democracy really bring prosperity and happiness in Indonesia? What is the reason for Indonesia's firm belief in the democratic process and progress? These are questions, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, which have long occupied the minds of many Indonesian leaders. These problems, I think, also raise doubts—or hopes—among the statesmen and politicians of a number

of Western countries about the ability of the Indonesian people to outlive the shock of national responsibility in this turbulent world.

My answer, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker is: Have no doubt about that.

Five Principles

Immediately we had proclaimed our independence in August 1945, we attached as preamble to our Constitution the Pantja Sila, the five guiding principles of our national life. Perhaps you know already what our Pantja Sila is. It gives us the five principles of our State. These are:

First, belief in God.

Second, nationalism.

Third, humanity.

Fourth, democracy.

Fifth, social justice.

These five principles are the combined reflection of Indonesia's natural climate and the personality of its inhabitants. They were also partly formulated by President Eisenhower in his speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on the 21st of April last, when he spoke of certain principles:²

First, "They believe deeply in the right of self-government";

Second, "They believe deeply in the dignity of man";

Third, "They aspire to improve the welfare of the individual, as a basic aim of organized society."

So again, have no doubts about democracy in Indonesia. Even in the most difficult years immediately after the recognition of sovereignty, we were able to guard the unity of our country through another democratic concept, expressed in the motto of the State, "Bhinneka Tunggal Ika"—Unity in Diversity. Voluntary loyalty to the Indonesian motherland as a whole has been settled in our country without compulsion, without the process of civil war, despite subversive actions by people who do not want to see us free, despite provocation at home and abroad.

Having survived the early, most critical years of our national existence, more attention can be paid to upbuilding and rehabilitation, and especially to the investment of human skill. Just before I left Indonesia, we inaugurated a campaign for village community development, and Parlia-

² BULLETIN of Apr. 30, 1956, p. 699.

ment is soon to discuss the first national 5-year plan, with a total allocation of 11 billion rupiahs, or \$1 billion.

However important they may be, our own national efforts on their own will not suffice to achieve steady progress toward viability for our country against the impact of economic or political competition from overseas. It is in this field that we ask your understanding and your cooperation for our mutual benefit. America is known the world over for generosity; if I am not mistaken the American taxpayer has already spent more than \$50 billion in foreign aid. But that aid has brought variable results. An example of good results is the recovery of Western Europe after World War II; other results are still prospective in other parts of the world, whereas elsewhere American aid is regarded as of doubtful benefit for national progress.

Technical Assistance

Indonesia is indeed grateful for the technical assistance she has received to date from America, and in acknowledging my gratitude I want to express myself with the frankness of a friend. Am I allowed to be frank, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker? For the furtherance of their function as defenders of freedom, America and Indonesia need to realize how to obtain lasting results, and these depend upon the specific conditions of Asian countries and the development of the national aspirations of the Asian people, which, indeed, America cannot be expected immediately to know or to understand. The approach to the question of foreign aid should be based upon different principles in different countries. Without adequate knowledge of those countries, and even if your motives in granting aid were solely the stability of this region, the results could be adverse, and the flow of even billions of dollars could lead only to strained relations. Certainly military aid is no substitute for Asian stability. It will only serve to make countries accepting it more dependent upon America, and their worth as genuine partners in the universal struggle for liberty, peace, and prosperity will consequently decline. The main aim should be for the people of Asia, like the Western nations, to become economically stable but also politically stable and thus be able to defend their freedom against all assaults. Political stability comes only with the stability of

the political heart. And this heart of ours is now still an unsatisfied heart. The Asian people must soon be brought to the stage of development where they are capable of cherishing their hard-won freedom.

This two-sided struggle is a longer and a harder struggle, but until it is won, the process of emancipation of our people will not be complete. The Republic of Indonesia is a democracy which has leaned heavily upon the experience of the West, and particularly of your great Union, for its national ideals. We know that is not enough. To the famished man, democracy can never be more than a slogan. What can a vote mean to a woman worn out by toil, whose children fret and ail with the fever of malaria? Democracy is not merely government by the people; democracy is also government for the people.

The fight for the emancipation of our people is our fight, and, believe me, we shall not shirk it. We ask for your understanding of it and your sympathy with it. We will accept with the greatest appreciation any assistance that may come to us, from whatever quarter it may come, for that assistance will lighten our burdens and shorten our struggle. Such assistance is not one-sided but is of mutual benefit. Out of it comes a greater measure of good will, and—perhaps more important—out of it comes a greater volume of production in the world. But, from whatever quarter of this divided globe that assistance comes, we are determined that no material advantage will buy from us any part of our hard-won freedom, for that freedom is more dear to us than the products which any country can give or sell. We welcome assistance on terms of mutual benefit. We reject the idea of exchanging intellectual and spiritual independence or physical liberty for momentary advantage.

And now, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, finally, may I say this:

We live in a troubled world, in which man cannot rest and cannot give his whole thought and effort to the welfare of mankind. A shadow, pregnant with horror, hangs over the future. It is a man-made shadow, and its mushroom shape colors all our thoughts and all our dreams. In their technical and scientific skill, men have created something whose potentiality for good or evil is so great that the imagination of the same men is overpowered.

So far, the full horror of this latest of mankind's achievements has not burst on the world. So far

only small samples of this victory over nature have been used for their designed purpose. And what is that purpose? May God forbid that man should ever take upon himself the responsibility for the use of this weapon. The destruction of this world is not the prerogative of man.

There is irony in the fact that, for the first time ever, man has it within his power to make the desert bloom like a garden, to banish poverty and want from the world, to open up a new era of brotherhood, and yet, at the same time, no man can look with confidence into the future. The rivers and the tides obey our command; we bstride the skies and pluck wealth from under the earth and the sea; we conquer the age-old plagues of humanity and even fight a winning battle against death. At the same time, we dig ourselves shelters in the rocks and prepare to sit and die in them, as man did during the dawn of the world. Have we then made so little progress? Have we learned nothing?

It may be that war is a natural function of man and that his combative feelings prevent his living in peace with his neighbors. It may be so, but I do not believe it.

In any case, should the new weapons begin to fall, the question would be academic, for then we would have not war but universal death and the end of mankind's brief civilization. It is true that repeatedly throughout history man has crucified himself, only to rise again. Let there be no mistake about it. After an atomic war there would be no resurrection. Certainly we cannot let things slide and trust to luck that no megalomaniac will press the fateful trigger.

Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, in saying these things to you, I am well aware that I am saying nothing you do not already know, for this Congress of the United States of America has given anxious thought to this matter. We who have not got the atom bomb, we will watch every move you take in this matter. With hope in our hearts but fear in our breasts, we will applaud everything which helps to make the future safe for our children. We will support every action taken by you, or the responsible leaders of any country, to remove the shadow of the atom bomb from this world.

May God give men the will to avert calamity.

And may He give us, America and Indonesia, the best friendship which has ever existed between two nations.

ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, MAY 18

It is a rather overpowering experience to meet at one time so many men and women of the press. It is overpowering and in some ways rather frightening, for indeed the press of the world is a mighty implement for good or evil. I recall the words of Mark Twain who was also impressed by the power of this tool. Mark Twain once wrote, "There are only two forces that can carry light into all the corners of the world—only two: the sun in the heavens, and the Associated Press down here." With all of Mark Twain's experiences, he never faced 600 journalists, not only of the Associated Press but of all parts of the world. Moreover, I was always glad to note that he put the sun first. This at least must impress upon all journalists—and all of us—a proper and due sense of humility.

I am expected to talk to you, presumably to talk about Indonesia, but talking to experts is a difficult matter. Nevertheless, this is an opportunity for which I am profoundly grateful because it not only allows me to renew many old acquaintanceships but to make many new ones.

One of the most far-reaching effects of technical progress has surely been in the sphere of communications between the nations of the world. What is done in one country today is known to all the world tomorrow. It is known, and it is praised or criticized. This has the great advantage that the actions of all governments are bathed in the light of day—and presumably in the light of the press. It means that public opinion is in truth a factor of international affairs, and one which can be ignored by no government, whatever its political color. It means, too, that what happens in one country has its effects the world over. If one man suffers under tyranny, the stature of all men is lessened; if one man reaches a little further toward justice, then the chains of all men are weakened. The historical task of the press is to seek out the facts, to publish the facts, and to analyze the facts. The degree of success in that task influences in large measure the opinions, and thus the actions, of all states. It is a heavy responsibility to bear, but I think the Fourth Estate is not afraid of responsibility.

As a matter of fact, that willingness to accept responsibility is a characteristic of men in this 20th century. The world would be in a sorry state if it were not so. And yet those responsibilities have in many cases been heavier than anything previously

imposed upon man. Which of us would exchange our position in life for that of the President of the United States who had to decide whether or not the atomic bomb should be dropped? Who amongst us would take the burden of deciding between guns and butter for our people?

The irony is that we could all have both guns and butter. Furthermore, if we all had butter, perhaps we would not want guns. We have indeed produced a strange world, one in which the highest ideals of human brotherhood are pronounced, while at the same time we prepare to destroy those same human brothers. We know how to overcome the problems of nature; we have not learned how to overcome the problems in our own minds and hearts.

And yet we have made progress. What was once a silver thread in the works of a visionary is now a reality in the world. The ideal of human fellowship has advanced and the ideal of each man being his brother's keeper is generally accepted, even if not yet generally implemented. We of Asia and now of Africa know this well.

Struggle Toward National Fulfillment

Our struggle toward national fulfillment has been eased by the assistance given by people of other countries and continents. The wheels of history have been oiled for us by understanding and sympathy. We have taken courage from the example and the burning words of others, and the night has been made radiant by the truth and high ideals so often expressed and so sincerely struggled for.

In truth this is one world, and the actions of all have an effect upon all. A little time ago I picked up, quite casually, a history book used in schools of my country. It was a book for children of 10 or 12 years old and is also used widely by adults who have, in their maturity, learned the art of reading.

That history book contained stories from all over the world of national heroes who had fought for the freedom of their country. It told of Washington and of Jefferson, of Garibaldi and of Mazzini, of Cromwell and of Ireton. Furthermore, it told of others in other countries. It spoke of names familiar to us, and beloved by us, but perhaps strange to you—of those in Egypt, in Turkey, in Morocco, in India, in Burma, in Japan, and in China. All of those great men struggled that

their nations might be free. Many died before that ideal could be realized, but the lamp they lit has never been, and will never be, extinguished. And all of those men were related one to the other by bonds of common action and common faith.

For what did they struggle? Yes, for their nations. But what is a nation? Many great thinkers have applied their minds to this. Many answers have been given, often conflicting, and usually confusing. One of the truest and most moving descriptions I know was contained in a short essay by a little-known professor of Ohio University. About 40 years ago, Professor Taylor wrote:

Where and what is the nation? Is there such a thing? You would answer that the nation exists only in the minds and hearts of men. It is an idea. It is therefore more real than its courts and armies; more real than its cities, its railroads, its mines, its cattle; more real than you and I are, for it existed in our fathers and will exist in our children. It is an idea, it is an imagination, it is a spirit, it is human art. Who will deny that the nation lives?

Yes, who will deny, who can deny, that the nation lives, even if all the political scientists fail to define it?

Effects of Colonialism

We of Asia are told that the troubles of our continent are due to nationalism. That is as wrong as saying that the world's troubles are due to atomic energy. It is true that there is turbulence in Asia, but that turbulence is the result and aftermath of colonialism and is not due to the liberating effects of nationalism. I say "the liberating effects of nationalism." I do not mean only that nations are again free of colonial bonds, but I mean that men feel themselves free. You who have never known colonialism can never appreciate what it does to man. The agrarian effects, the economic effects, the political effects can be measured. The effect on man's mind and spirit cannot. Regard it only in this simple light. For generations the political leaders of colonies work and aim for the destruction of the colonial governments. Perhaps the leaders understand the dangers inherent in cultivating a destructive mentality, but the mass of people know only their misery under colonialism and seek only the destruction of colonialism. Then, by one means or another, there comes independence. Immediately

that already weakened nation—weakened by colonialism and by the struggle against colonialism—immediately that nation must begin to seek a reorientation. Not destruction, but construction; not opposition, but support; not conflict, but cooperation. Is it surprising that sometimes independence proves to be a heady wine?

In any case, whether all the world approves or not, the fact is that nationalism and the liberation of nations are realities. They are the reality of international life. What we must do is learn to adjust international relations to this reality. We cannot afford the attempt to distort the reality to make it fit old patterns. In that way would lie disruption, and particularly disruption of the few precious world organizations we already have. The new nations of Asia and Africa are recent additions to an adult family. The older members of that family must not be jealous of the new arrivals.

The chief factor that these nations have in common is their nationalism and the concomitant release from colonialism. *To understand Asia and Africa, we must understand nationalism.* For us, it is the mainspring of action. This cannot be surprising to Western peoples, for the love of country, the spirit of patriotism, is a great element in life here also. There would have been no American War of Independence if nationalism had not burned with a hard and fierce flame in the breasts of the men of '76. Nearer home, it was nationalism which supported the Allied nations during their battles against the horrors of Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, or Imperial Japan.

I know that nationalism is today in many circles a suspect word and that it conveys ideas of chauvinism, of racial supremacy, and a dozen other ideologies that we reject. Those evil things are not nationalism, but distortions of nationalism. Do not confuse the distortions with the sound fruit. How foolish it would be to reject democracy because in some places and at some times democracy has been bent into shapes which are a perversion of the democratic ideal. Equally, how foolish it is to reject nationalism because it has sometimes been perverted.

This I know: We of Indonesia and the citizens of many countries of Asia and Africa have seen our dearest and best suffer and die, struggle and fail, and rise again to struggle and fail again—and again be resurrected from the very earth and finally achieve their goal. Something burned in

them; something inspired them. They called it nationalism. We who have followed and have seen what they built, but what they destroyed themselves in building—we, too, call their inspiration, and our inspiration, nationalism. For us, there is nothing ignoble in that word. On the contrary, it contains for us all that is best in mankind and all that is noblest.

Nationalism and Internationalism

Perhaps the future belongs to greater organizations than mere nations. Certainly the increasing trend toward internationalism is an encouraging sign of man's growing maturity. Perhaps the future will see the growth of international, supernational, and supranational bodies. That may be so. In any case, those bodies cannot be built until nations are built first. You cannot establish international bodies until nations have established their national identities. You cannot build supernational and supranational bodies without using nations as the foundations and the brick and the keystones.

Therefore I say: Do not denigrate our nationalism. Try to understand and sympathize with it. It is at least a positive creed, an active belief, and has none of the cynicism and lassitude of other less virile outlooks.

Whatever can be said of my nation, no one can accuse it of being static. It is on the move, and the revolutionary impetus of 11 years ago is still strong. In fact, that impetus received new strength as we moved, after our first nationwide general election, into a new phase of activity. Today we have a Parliament elected by the people and closely reflecting the political views of the people. We have a Government supported by that Parliament and responsible to it. We have, in fact, all the trappings of political democracy. That is progress. In 11 years we have passed through stages of political development that older nations encompassed in generations. We have even gone beyond the stage of political democracy reached by some states established for centuries. I say that in no spirit of boasting, but as a record of fact. With us, voting is universal and secret, and some democratic states have not yet accepted such methods.

Of course, we make mistakes; of course, we are sometimes too eager for the immediate result. Of course, we sometimes seem to carry things beyond

their logical conclusion. But please remember this. Ours is still a revolutionary nation and a nation which, only 11 years ago, was 350 years out of date. We are in a hurry because the world has no intention of standing still while we catch up. We must cram the experience of centuries into a generation, and it is important for us that the revolutionary spirit of self-sacrifice and solidarity should be maintained. That is our driving force.

Rejection of Colonialism

One misunderstanding should be eliminated immediately. *We are not anti-West.* We may, in fact we do, sometimes oppose what is called the West. But that is not dictated by a feeling of being anti-West. In our relations with the world, we seek always what we believe to be the best road for humanity as a whole. Sometimes, no doubt, we are wrong. At other times, I have equally no doubt, we are right. It is true that there is one manifestation of the West which we—and all of Asia—completely reject and will continue to reject. That manifestation is colonialism. We are told that we see only one sort of colonialism, and that sort is dead. Well, we have experienced only one sort of colonialism, and that came to us from the West. However, I would like to recall to your minds that the Bandung conference last year unanimously expressed its opposition to colonialism in all its forms—yes, in all its forms, whether it is economic colonialism, physical colonialism, classical colonialism, or the colonialism of a small, alien body within a nation.

As I said, we are told that colonialism is dead and that we are whipping a dead horse. My reply to that is a simple one. Come to Asia and see for yourselves. Travel to Africa and see for yourselves. Colonialism, even in its classical form, is *not dead* so long as one nation is unfree, so long as the vision of the United Nations Charter is not applied to one territory, so long as brother is divided from brother by a colonial barrier. Colonialism will not be dead until the domination of one people by another is ended. Colonialism will not be dead until nations—including my nation—are reunited in that freedom which is the birthright of all men. Rationalization of these facts is dangerous. There is no such thing as a beneficent colonialism, just as there is no such thing as a beneficent disease. Colonialism, the

history of the postwar years shows, does not train for self-government; it trains only for hatred, and that hatred can be directed against the quarter from which colonialism comes, as well as against colonialism itself.

In America, I know it is not necessary for anyone to defend or apologize for a policy of anticolonialism. It is often necessary, however, to defend the fruits and results of such a policy, particularly if, on occasion, that policy appears to run counter to the policy of this country and its associated countries. Let us try to look at the very basic facts of the policy followed by this country. What is the real object of it? The object is not the defeat of communism in the world. In your view that is a most desirable thing. But it is not the object of your policy. No. I think you would agree, and the leaders of your Nation would agree, that you are seeking a larger freedom for mankind. Communism appears to you to stand in the way of that object; therefore you oppose communism. To see the defeat of communism as the end of policy is to confuse military victory with the aims of war.

Now, what is the object of our policy? What is the object of Indonesia's policy? It is to seek a larger freedom for mankind. In doing so, we seek to shake off the final bonds and effects of colonialism. Thus the object of our policy is the same as the object of your policy. We differ in tactics because our immediate problems are different, but we have the same basic aim.

Accepting this, I think it can be agreed that there may well be more than one road to final consummation of a policy. We are not concerned with a problem in geometry, where the shortest distance between what we have and what we want is a straight line. In international affairs, a straight line can lead directly into the ruinous heart of a megaton explosion. We are dealing, not with mathematical postulates, we are dealing with men.

None of us, I feel sure, have the whole truth in our understanding. Perfect understanding is an attribute of God, not of man. It is, however, certain that we must continue searching for understanding. I know that the United States is the country where sociological research is taken most seriously. Much of that research is into the factors that divide humanity. I would like to see similar research into the factors that unite humanity. And there are many. I would like to see research, not into the cultural differentiation of man, but

into the cultural unity of man, into the factors which make men brothers and not just points on a statistician's graph. From Iceland to New Zealand, from Japan to New York, man is the same in his humanity. When we come to realize that and realize that the man is not the same as his personal iron curtain of prejudices, we are more than halfway to the fulfillment of our ideals.

Technological Indigestion

This is a very strange world we have inherited. In moments of frustration, I sometimes feel that man has reached for the stars and smeared his hands with primeval mud. We have penicillin and—the wonders of bacteriological warfare. We have rocket-powered bombing aircraft and—ox-drawn ploughs. We have atom bombs and—half the world lit by flickering oil lamps. We have television and—soap opera. Is it possible that our technical skill is surpassing our mental stature? I do not believe so, for I have a profound faith in the potentiality of man. What seems obvious is that we have a bad dose of technological indigestion and should really take greater care with our diet. It needs, I think, a better balance. It lacks a spiritual and moral content. In international affairs, we move—or stagger—from expedient to expedient and never quite catch up with the reality. In national affairs, we find it difficult to follow the basic principle of doing the greatest good for the greatest number of people because we do not know what is the greatest good. Yes, it is a puzzling world, a disturbing world, but a supremely challenging world.

Sometimes people have sympathized with me because long years of my life were spent in jail and in exile. Well, these years of jail and exile were a mixed experience. I hated them because they separated me from the dearest thing in the world, the struggle of my people for rebirth. At the same time, they were a blessing, because I had what is so rare in this world, the opportunity of thinking about basic issues, the opportunity of examining afresh the beliefs I held.

Since 1942, since the Japanese who occupied my country released me from exile, I have again been engaged in those things which surely provide the fullest and most beneficial use of the powers God has granted to any person. If I may say so without seeming to boast: I know my people; I know them up and down, inside and out. And now I will tell you this about them.

To all Indonesians, their country and their nation come first. They have fought for their land: it is theirs. They have fought for independence: it is theirs. They have fought for their national identity: it is theirs. They have fought for these things before and will fight again if anything openly threatens them or undermines them.

We are called "neutralist." We are not neutral and will never be neutral until man the world over is free. It is said we are sitting on the fence, but we have no intention of being trampled to death in the corral. It is said we have bitten the hand that fed us. I don't know about that, but we certainly had to bite the hand that starved us before we got rid of the colonial harness.

Plea for Understanding

In all seriousness, let me ask this of you: Seek to understand us. Give us, if you can, your sympathy, as I am sure you give your sympathy to what we are trying to do. Give us, if you can, your *active* sympathy and understanding. This will help us. It will also help the people of this great Nation and the whole world!

We have won our national independence, and we are trying to give that independence a genuine and worthwhile content for every hungry man, every weary woman, every unlettered child in our vast archipelago. A hungry man cannot eat a voting paper. We believe in methods and ideals of democracy, but it must be an economic and social democracy as well as a political democracy. In the midst of want, social inequality, and poverty, democracy cannot exist for long.

We seek the unity of our nation and are working, and will work, for the reinclusion of West Irian into the fold of that nation. We do this because it is a sore tribulation to us that any part of our country should still suffer colonialism, and no outpouring of words can disguise the fact that colonialism still rules there. We feel incomplete and unprotected without Irian, and we feel that the battle for even the most elementary stages of liberty is not yet won.

Understand that we are in the era of Asian and African nationalism. That, for Asia and Africa, is primary. No torrent of dollars, no cascade of rubles will change that. Equally, dollars and rubles will mean nothing unless they respect the national aspirations of the people of those continents.

Finally, let me assure you of this: Our inde-

pendence is not complete yet, but we value what we have, above all things. That independence is not for sale, and no currency will buy one scrap of it. Certainly, we will take assistance wherever it comes from because that assistance may stop a child crying from hunger or a man from being driven early to his grave, wornout by toil. But we will labor at our land and jungles with bare hands rather than exchange any part of our freedom for any sort of aid.

You have been very patient with me. Thank you all very much for that and for the opportunity of meeting you today.

"Merdeka"—that is Indonesia's greetings to you!

MEMBERS OF THE OFFICIAL PARTY*

Press release 260 dated May 16

Indonesian Members

Dr. Sukarno,
President of the Republic of Indonesia
Roeslan Abdulgani,
Minister for Foreign Affairs
Moekarto Notowidigdo,
Ambassador to the United States
Zainul Arifin,
First Deputy Chairman of the Parliament
Dr. Wirjono Prodjodikoro,
Chief Justice
Dr. Abdul Karim Pringgodigdo,
Director of the Cabinet
Sanusi Hardjadinata,
Governor of West Java
Dr. Sukiman Wirjosandjojo,
Member of Parliament
Vice Air Marshal Suryadarma,
Chief of Staff, Air Force
Mr. Suwirjo,
President Director of the Indonesian Industrial Bank
Dr. Johannes Leimena,
Member of Parliament
Sutarto Hadisudibjo,
Member of Parliament
Colonel Nazir,
Commander of Naval Bases in Java
Colonel J. F. Warrouw,
Commander, Seventh Army Division
Dr. Ouw Eng Liang,
Physician to the President
Lientenant Colonel Sugandhy,
Aide-de-Camp to the President

* Revised list; original list and program were announced in press releases 251 of May 11 and 258 of May 15 (not printed).

U.S. Members

Hugh S. Cumming, Jr.,
Ambassador to the Republic of Indonesia
John F. Simmons,
Chief of Protocol, Department of State
Maj. Gen. Gordon R. Rogers, U. S. A.,
American Aide to President Sukarno
Clement E. Conger,
Assistant Chief of Protocol, Department of State
Jameson Parker,
Press Officer, Department of State

U.S. Policy on Right of Asylum

White House press release dated May 24

The Soviet Government and its satellites in Eastern Europe have shown unusual interest in inducing the return of refugees from these countries, particularly those resident in Western Europe and more recently those in the United States. The formation of repatriation committees, proclamations by the various governments of amnesties for citizens who have escaped, and personal contact on the part of official Soviet-bloc representatives abroad are manifestations of this concern.

The objects of this activity are to induce the return of those who have fled from Communist oppression and to sow fear and dissension among those who choose to remain in the West. Any means at hand—such as alleged appeals from relatives—are employed in the campaign.

Refugees from Communist countries have displayed great steadfastness in the face of the strong pressures exerted upon them to return to their homelands. The number of those who have gone back is insignificant in comparison with those who seek freedom and security in the West. And the continued flow of refugees to the free world, despite all the efforts of the Communist authorities to prevent it, is the best answer to the propaganda offering illusory prospects to those who are prepared to give up their freedom for life under a dictatorship.

The West as a whole has shown a deep sense of responsibility for those who have sought haven in its territories from Communist tyranny and regimentation. The receiving countries have already taken in more than one million refugees since 1945 and, despite the many problems connected with resettlement, have done their best to provide homes and jobs and the opportunity to become productive and respected citizens in a free

society. Those who have not yet been provided for continue to be objects of concern and sympathy. The United States has been happy to contribute its share to this mass resettlement operation, which is continuing because it is in accord with American traditions to protect and assist those fleeing from persecution.

It is likewise U.S. policy that any person in this country, including those who have sought asylum here, shall have a free choice to leave the United States. It is also the right of this Government to satisfy itself through its responsible agencies that the individual is leaving this country only of his own free will.

The United States is taking action against instances of improper and irregular pressure by officials of foreign governments seeking to influence persons who have sought asylum in this country. The United States has already taken steps which make clear its determination to extend the full protection of American laws to all aliens residing here.

The right of asylum is one of the treasured traditions of free peoples. The United States intends to continue firmly to adhere to and uphold this principle.

U.S. and Canada To Examine Subject of Boundary Waters

Press release 275 dated May 23

The Canadian and United States Governments have decided to examine together the subject of waters which flow across the international boundary between the two countries.

The last time both Governments examined this matter thoroughly together was before the conclusion of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. During the 46 years which have elapsed since its ratification, the International Joint Commission, which was established by the treaty, has worked with outstanding success in solving water problems within the framework of this treaty.

It has recently appeared, however, that the development of the resources of such basins as the St. John, the Columbia, and the Yukon requires, among other things, the solution of various complicated legal, economic, and engineering questions. In agreeing to examine the matter of waters which cross the boundary, the two Governments

realize that there may be no easy or quick answer to the problems which are arising today in such areas and that the studies may reveal that the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 is sufficiently broad to meet present problems. The two Governments believe, however, that a full and confidential exchange of views may contribute to the resolution of these problems, and it is in this spirit that the discussions have been agreed to. At the same time, the two Governments desire that the International Joint Commission shall press forward its studies under the Columbia River Basin Reference of 1944 and the other similar References which it has under consideration.

Visa Applications Cut Off for Certain Polish Refugees

Press release 278 dated May 24

Because of heavy oversubscription of the 2,000 visas allotted by the Refugee Relief Act to refugees who were members of the armed forces of the Republic of Poland during World War II, were honorably discharged, and resided in the British Isles when the Refugee Act was enacted, the Department of State announced on May 24 that it would accept no new applications for such visas after midnight, June 4, 1956. As of May 18, 1,448 visas have been issued to such Polish refugees. For the remaining 552 visas, there were pending 1,722 applications.

In instructions to the consulates, Pierce J. Gerety, Deputy Administrator of the Refugee Relief Program, emphasized that:

(1) The cutoff would not apply to orphan applicants residing in Great Britain who are processed under another section of the act.

(2) Although assurances received after the cutoff date will not be processed under the Refugee Relief Act, such assurances will be sent to the appropriate consular authorities to permit the applicant to establish a priority registration date under the normal annual quota of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(3) The cutoff does not apply to Poles who may be eligible under the refugee program to come to the United States from other countries than Great Britain.

As of May 18, the total worldwide issuance of visas under the Refugee Relief Act was 108,819.

Department of State Bulletin

World Bank Reports \$21.2 Million Net Income for 9-Month Period

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development on May 7 reported a net income of \$21.2 million for the 9-month period ending March 31, 1956, compared with \$18.6 million for the corresponding period in 1955. This income was placed in the supplemental reserve against losses on loans and guaranties, and raised the reserve to \$142.7 million. Loan commissions amounted to \$10.9 million and were credited to the bank's special reserve, increasing that reserve to \$73.2 million. Total reserves on March 31, 1956, were \$215.9 million.

Gross income, exclusive of loans commissions, was \$47.3 million, compared with \$43.8 million in 1955. Expenses, which included \$20.6 million for interest on bank bonds and other financial expenses, totaled \$26.1 million for the period.

During the third quarter of this fiscal year, the bank made two loans totaling \$13.1 million in Japan and Ecuador. This brought the total number of loans to 141 in 41 countries and raised the gross total of commitments to \$2,483.5 million. Disbursements on loans for the 9-month period were \$215.6 million, bringing total disbursements to \$1,895.3 million.

U.S. Signs GATT Protocol of Supplementary Concessions

Press release 274 dated May 23

On May 23 Herbert V. Prochnow, Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, signed at Geneva on behalf of the United States the Protocol of Supplementary Concessions embodying the results of the tariff negotiations begun on January 18 under the auspices of the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The opening of this protocol for signature formally marks the end of the 1956 tariff conference.

The United States successfully concluded negotiations with all the 21 other countries participating in the conference. An analysis of the results of the negotiations completed by the United States will be issued on June 7, and a Presidential proclamation giving effect on June 30 to the concessions granted by the United States will be issued about the same time.

The conference included not only 22 countries which are Contracting Parties to the GATT but also the High Authority acting on behalf of the member states of the European Coal and Steel Community.

The parties engaged in some 60 intergovernmental negotiations for the stabilization or reduction of tariff barriers. The results will be incorporated in the tariff schedules of the GATT. The import trade of the negotiating countries in the items affected by concessions granted in the negotiations is estimated at about \$2.5 billion a year.

The 1956 tariff conference is the latest in a series of multilateral negotiations carried out by the Contracting Parties to the GATT. The first negotiating conference was held at Geneva in 1947, and subsequent conferences were held at Annecy, France, in 1949 and at Torquay, England, in 1950-51. Further negotiations were conducted at Geneva in 1955 in connection with the accession of Japan to the GATT.

The following Contracting Parties completed negotiations:

Australia	France
Austria	Federal Republic of Germany
Benelux Customs Union	Haiti
(a) Belgium	Italy
(b) Luxembourg	Japan
(c) Kingdom of the Netherlands	Norway
Canada	Peru
Chile	Sweden
Cuba	Turkey
Denmark	United Kingdom
Dominican Republic	United States
Finland	

The United States participated in the negotiations under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act, which authorizes the President, within limits and under prescribed procedures, to make concessions in U.S. tariff treatment in exchange for reciprocal concessions from other countries which will promote U.S. foreign trade.

The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 authorizes the President to reduce tariffs to rates 15 percent below rates existing on January 1, 1955. The act also authorizes the President to reduce rates that are above 50 percent ad valorem to 50 percent. The reductions are to be put into effect by stages pursuant to the law, the first stage in most cases to be put into effect by June 30, 1956.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Calendar of Meetings¹

Adjourned During May 1956

GATT Contracting Parties: 1956 Tariff Negotiations	Geneva	Jan. 18-May 23
U.N. Disarmament Commission: Subcommittee of Five (reconvened).	London	Mar. 19-May 4
U.N. ECOSOC Statistical Commission: 9th Session	New York	Apr. 16-May 4
U.N. Economic and Social Council: 21st Session.	New York	Apr. 17-May 4
UNESCO Conference on Asian-U.S. Cultural Relations.	San Francisco, Minneapolis, Boston, Louisville, Ann Arbor, Washington.	Apr. 19-May 19
ITU Administrative Council: 11th Session	Geneva	Apr. 21-May 19
UNESCO Conference on Free and Compulsory Education in Latin America.	Lima	Apr. 23-May 5
South Pacific Conference: 3d Session	Suva (Fiji)	Apr. 23-May 6
9th International Film Festival	Cannes	Apr. 23-May 10
U.N. ECOSOC Commission on Narcotic Drugs: 11th Session	Geneva	Apr. 23-May 19
Inter-American Port and Harbor Conference	San José	Apr. 25-May 3
U.N. Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories: 7th Session.	New York	Apr. 27-May 18
5th International Philatelic Exhibition (FIPEX).	New York	Apr. 28-May 6
ILO Coal Mines Committee: 6th Session	Istanbul	Apr. 30-May 12
UPU Executive and Liaison Committee	Bern	Apr. 30-May 12
Inter-American Indian Institute: Governing Board	México, D. F.	May 3 (1 day)
U.N. Exploratory Meeting on International Trade in Cocoa	New York	May 3-4
2d Inter-American Meeting of Ministers of Education	Lima	May 3-9
Inter-American Cultural Council: 2d Meeting	Lima	May 3-12
NATO: Ministerial Meeting of the Council	Paris	May 4-6
South Pacific Commission: 15th Session	Suva (Fiji)	May 4-9
U.N. ECOSOC Commission on International Commodity Trade: 3d Session.	New York	May 7-18
U.N. <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on the Establishment of SUNFED: 1st Meeting.	New York	May 7-23
International Tin Study Group: Management Committee	London	May 8 (1 day)
International Cotton Advisory Committee: 15th Meeting	Washington	May 8-17
9th World Health Assembly	Geneva	May 8-25
UNESCO Regional Seminar on Primary School Curriculum for Latin America.	Lima	May 9-22
U.N. ECLA Committee of the Whole: 5th Meeting	Santiago	May 14-15
U.N. ECE Housing Committee and Working Parties: 12th Session	Geneva	May 14-16
ILO Building, Civil Engineering, and Public Works Committee: 5th Session.	Geneva	May 14-26
Inter-American Technical Cacao Committee: 6th Meeting	Salvador (Brazil)	May 20-27
U.N. ECE Working Group on Indicators of Short-Term Economic Changes: 1st Session.	Geneva	May 22-26
UNREF Standing Program Subcommittee: 3d Session	Geneva	May 23-25
UNESCO Meeting of Experts on Radioisotopes	Paris	May 25-28

In Session as of May 31, 1956

North Pacific Fur Seal Conference	Washington	Nov. 28 (1955)-
U.N. International Law Commission: 8th Session	Geneva	Apr. 23-
U.N. Committee of Experts To Review the Salaries, Allowances, and Benefits System.	New York	May 10-
U.N. International Sugar Conference	New York	May 21-
WMO: 2d World Comparison of Radiosondes	Payerne (Switzerland)	May 23-
Caribbean Commission: 22d Meeting	Cayenne (French Guiana)	May 24-
FAO Joint Subcommittee on Mediterranean Forestry Problems	Nice	May 27-
PAIGH Directing Council: 1st Meeting	México, D.F.	May 28-
ILO Governing Body: 132d Session.	Geneva	May 28-
UNREF Executive Committee: 3d Session	Geneva	May 28-
WHO Executive Board: 18th Session	Geneva	May 28-
U.N. Conference of Plenipotentiaries on Maintenance Obligations.	New York	May 29-
16th International Conference on Large Electric High-Tension Systems (CIGRE).	Paris	May 30-

Calendar of Meetings—Continued

Scheduled June 1–August 31, 1956

Inter-American Commission of Women: 11th General Assembly . . .	Ciudad Trujillo	June 1–
International Seed Testing Association: 11th Congress (Executive Committee Meetings June 1 and 10).	Paris	June 4–
PASO Executive Committee: 28th Meeting	Washington	June 5–
International Meeting of Tonnage Measurement Experts	Copenhagen	June 5–
U.N. ECAFE Working Party of Senior Geologists on the Preparation of a Regional Geological Map for Asia and the Far East: 2d Meeting.	Tokyo	June 5–
International Labor Conference (ILO): 39th Session	Geneva	June 6–
International Commission for Criminal Police: 25th General Meeting.	Vienna	June 7–
U.N. Trusteeship Council: 18th Session	New York	June 7–
International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries: 6th Annual Meeting.	Halifax	June 11–
UNESCO Intergovernmental Copyright Committee	Paris	June 11–
U.N. ECAFE Subcommittee on Minerals Resources Development: 2d Meeting.	Tokyo	June 12–
International Rubber Study Group: Management Committee . . .	Paris	June 14–
5th World Power Conference	Vienna	June 17–
FAO Council: 24th Session	Rome	June 18–
FAO Committee on Commodity Problems: 27th Session	Rome	June 18–
ICAO Assembly: 10th Session	Caracas	June 19–
FAO Committee on Relations with International Organizations . .	Rome	June 21–
Commemorative Meeting of Presidents of American Republics . .	Panama	June 24–
5th International Congress on Bridge and Structural Engineering .	Lisbon	June 25–
FAO Meeting of Fish Processing Technologists	Rotterdam	June 25–
U.N. ECE Coal Trade Subcommittee	Geneva	June 25–
U.N. ECE Coal Classification Working Party	Geneva	June 26–
U.N. ECE Coal Utilization Working Party	Geneva	June 29–
FAO Technical Advisory Committee on Desert Locust Control: 6th Session.	Tehran	July 3–
U.N. Economic and Social Council: 22d Session	Geneva	July 3–
FAO International Union of Forest Research Organizations: 12th Congress.	Oxford (England)	July 7–
FAO Desert Locust Control Committee: 3d Session	Tehran	July 8
19th International Conference on Public Education (Joint IBE/UNESCO).	Geneva	July 9–
UNESCO Executive Board: 44th Session	Paris	July 11–
FAO Technical Panel on Forestry Education: 1st <i>Ad Hoc</i> Meeting .	Oxford (England)	July 13–
International Whaling Commission: 8th Meeting	London	July 16–
International Congress on Housing and Town Planning	Vienna	July 22–
FAO Meeting on Control of Tick-Borne Diseases of Livestock . . .	Rome	July 23–
International Association of Theoretical and Applied Limnology: 13th Congress.	Helsinki	July 27–
20th International Physiological Congress	Brussels	July 30–
U.N. ECAFE Working Party on Housing and Building Materials: 4th Meeting.	Bangkok	July 30–
South Pacific Commission: Technical Conference on Community Development.	Hollandia (New Guinea)	July or August
U.N. ECOSOC Technical Assistance Committee	Geneva	July
8th International Conference of Social Work	Munich	Aug. 5–
U.N. European Regional Consultative Group on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders: 3d Session.	Geneva	Aug. 6–
18th International Geographical Congress	Rio de Janeiro	Aug. 9–
International Geographical Union: 9th General Assembly	Rio de Janeiro	Aug. 9–
ITU International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR): 8th Plenary Session.	Warsaw	Aug. 9–
International Exhibition of Cinematographic Art	Venice	Aug. 16–
10th International Congress of Entomology	Montreal	Aug. 17–
Edinburgh Film Festival	Edinburgh	Aug. 19–
American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood: Directing Council.	Montevideo	Aug. 27–
International Congress of Soil Science: 6th Congress	Paris	Aug. 29–

¹ Prepared in the Office of International Conferences, May 23, 1956. Following is a list of abbreviations: GATT, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; U.N., United Nations; ECOSOC, Economic and Social Council; UNESCO, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; ITU, International Telecommunication Union; ILO, International Labor Organization; UPU, Universal Postal Union; NATO, North Atlantic Treaty Organization; SUNFED, Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development; ECLA, Economic Commission for Latin America; ECE, Economic Commission for Europe; UNREF, United Nations Refugee Fund; WMO, World Meteorological Organization; FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization; PAIGH, Pan American Institute of Geography and History; WHO, World Health Organization; CIGRE, Conférence internationale des grands réseaux électriques; PASO, Pan American Sanitary Organization; ECAFE, Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East; ICAO, International Civil Aviation Organization; IBE, International Bureau of Education; CCIR, Comité consultatif international des radiocommunications.

Financing the Continuing Movement of Migrants From Europe

THIRD AND FOURTH SESSIONS OF COUNCIL AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION

by George L. Warren

The Council and Executive Committee of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) met at Geneva, Switzerland, in their third session from October 6 through October 22, 1955, and in their fourth session from February 14 through February 24, 1956.¹ The chief subject under discussion at both sessions was the problem of financing the operational activities of the Committee during 1956.

At the third session the Council adopted a budget for 1956 based on an estimated movement of 125,900 migrants and refugees out of Europe and calling for a total of \$43,759,342: \$2,690,366 for administrative expenditure and \$41,068,976 for operational expenditure. However, the total of contributions which government members were prepared to offer at the third session fell short of the amount called for in the budget by \$2,700,000. As the cash resources of the Committee had been exhausted by the movement of 120,422 persons out of Europe during 1955, the Council was under the necessity of convening the fourth session early in 1956 in order that the Director of the Committee might have precise knowledge of the income available for operations before such

operations were too far advanced in 1956. The problem was satisfactorily resolved at the fourth session.

The Migration Committee was organized on United States initiative at Brussels in 1951. It now includes 26 member governments. The Committee is engaged in securing increased movement of migrants and refugees who would not otherwise emigrate out of the overcrowded countries of Europe to overseas countries of immigration. Under a constitution which came into force in October 1954 and has been accepted by 24 member governments, the Council is composed of all member governments and the Executive Committee of nine.

The following 23 governments were represented at the third and fourth sessions:

Argentina	Greece
Australia ²	Israel
Austria	Italy ²
Belgium	Netherlands ²
Brazil ²	New Zealand
Canada ²	Norway
Chile ²	Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland
Colombia	Sweden
Costa Rica	Switzerland
Denmark	United States ²
France ²	Venezuela
Federal Republic of Germany ²	

¹ For an article on the second session of the Council and the Executive Committee, see BULLETIN of Aug. 22, 1955, p. 308. For announcements of the U.S. delegations to the third and fourth sessions, see *ibid.*, Oct. 17, 1955, p. 634, and Feb. 27, 1956, p. 355.

² Member of the Executive Committee.

• Mr. Warren is Adviser on Refugees and Displaced Persons, Department of State. He served as principal adviser to the U.S. delegation at the third session of the ICEM Council and Executive Committee, and alternate U.S. representative at the fourth session.

The Government of Paraguay was not represented at either session. Uruguay was not represented at the third session and accepted observer status at the fourth session, pending formal acceptance of the constitution. Luxembourg was represented at the third but not at the fourth session.

The Holy See, the Governments of the Dominican Republic, Spain, the United Kingdom, and the Union of South Africa were represented at both sessions as observers. The representatives of Spain and the Union of South Africa indicated that negotiations concerning membership in the Committee were about to be concluded. The United Nations, the International Labor Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the Council of Europe, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, and nongovernmental organizations interested in migration were also represented as observers.

The Executive Committee met in advance of each session of the Council under the chairmanship of Eric O. van Boetzelaer (Netherlands) and prepared recommendations for action by the Council. At the third session, the Council adopted staff regulations for employees that had been drafted by the Executive Committee and thus completed the final step in the organization of the Migration Committee and the determination of its regulations and procedures.

Migration Services

The Council also gave considerable attention to the question of migration services supplied by the Committee. These services consist of information to migrants concerning opportunities in the countries of immigration, language training, orientation instructions, vocational training, the preselection of migrants and processing for emigration, embarkation services, reception in the immigration country, and the placement of migrants in employment after arrival in the receiving country. All services are supplied at the direct request of the governments concerned. The costs of the services are shared with the governments under arrangements which envisage the eventual assumption by the governments of the full costs of the services supplied.

Assistance in the preselection of migrants, in

processing them for emigration, in embarkation, and in reception is an integral part of the process of movement. The other services are aimed at improving the qualifications of migrants and assisting their successful adjustment in the country of immigration. Vocational training is provided only for those who have already been selected for emigration by the recruiting missions of the receiving countries.

While expressions of support for the provision of migration services by the Migration Committee reflected the direct benefits received from the services by individual government members, all agreed that those services directly connected with movement were essential and should be continued. Some governments expressed concern that more might be attempted in the field of vocational training than the resources of the Migration Committee could support. The Director, Harold H. Tittmann, Jr., assured the Council, however, that most of the expenditures for vocational training were borne by the interested governments and that the role of the Migration Committee was restricted to the planning of training and the provision of experts when required. He also explained that the Committee tried only to supply the minimum of basic training to assist the migrant in securing employment after emigration. No final decisions were taken with respect to migration services, and the Director was requested to report further on developing experience at a later session.

Differences of views, which were not resolved at the session, were expressed with respect to the Migrant Contribution Plan presented by the Director. Most governments, including Italy and the United States, expressed strong support for encouraging the migrant to contribute as much as he could to the cost of his transportation. Australia, New Zealand, and the Netherlands expressed equally strong convictions that, although the migrant might be required to make prepayment in advance of his movement, he should not be burdened with the necessity of making installment payments after arrival in the country of immigration because such a burden would hinder his readjustment in the new country.

The Council learned during the discussion that approximately 93 percent of the migrants presently moved contribute in some manner to the costs of their transportation and that complete application of the Migrant Contribution Plan

might increase the Committee's resources by as much as one million dollars annually in later years. Under the revolving funds administered by the voluntary agencies, to which both the Migration Committee and the voluntary agencies have contributed, over 50,000 migrants were assisted by loans in 1952, 1953, and 1954 to meet a substantial part of their transportation costs. The extent of repayment on these loans has been most creditable. Of the loans made in 1952, more than 64 percent was repaid by 1955, and of those made in 1953, more than 41 percent.

Problem of Financing 1956 Operations

The main preoccupation of the Council at the third session was with the problem of financing operations for 1956. The budget of movement adopted called for \$2,700,000 more in income than current contributions of governments would produce. This situation resulted from the fact that the contributions of individual member governments are based in the main on per capita rates applied to persons actually moved to or from their particular countries. The totals of the contributions thus related to specific movements do not in most instances cover the actual costs of these movements, and the Migration Committee must in consequence subsidize the deficit movements from its own resources. Movements to certain destinations like Australia call for larger subsidies than others, while some movements earn sufficient income to cover the costs involved. During 1954 and 1955 the Migration Committee had been able to provide the subsidies required from the funds carried over from the operations of previous years and from increased contributions of member governments. It was not anticipated, however, that there would be any substantial funds carried over into 1956.

As the government members were not prepared in October to pledge the additional income of \$2,700,000 required, the Council decided to establish a Working Party of five member governments, Argentina, Australia, Italy, the Netherlands, and the United States, to explore the problem further and to make recommendations well in advance of the fourth session to be convened in February 1956.

During the course of the third session, Viscount Malvern, Prime Minister of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, J. G. Suurhoff, Minister of Social Affairs and Public Health of the Nether-

lands, Dino Del Bo, Under Secretary of State of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Italy, and Pierre Schneider, Chairman of the French National Assembly and Special Representative of the Council of Europe, made important statements to the Council concerning their governments' views on the problems of migration. Pierre Micheli (Switzerland) presided as chairman at the third session. Victor Montoya (Venezuela) served as vice chairman, Tyge Haarlov (Denmark) as second vice chairman, and Ralph Harry (Australia) as rapporteur.

The Working Party met at Washington in December 1955. After a thorough study of the financial problem which had been created in part by the fact that a larger proportion of the total annual movement—over 40 percent—was to go to Australia in 1956, the Working Party recommended that a Special Fund of \$3,000,000 be created. All additional contributions of government members resulting from increased rates of per capita payments or otherwise which constitute new income for the Committee for operations in 1956 would be credited to the Special Fund.

The Council on convening the fourth session in February elected Scott McLeod (United States) as chairman, Alzate Avendano (Colombia) as vice chairman, Tyge Haarlov (Denmark) as second vice chairman, and Kurt Seidler (Austria) as rapporteur. Before relinquishing the chair to Mr. McLeod, the retiring chairman, Pierre Micheli (Switzerland) paid a tribute to the late Congressman Chauncey W. Reed, who played a major role as a member of a number of U.S. delegations to ICEM in the creation and development of the Migration Committee, particularly in the drafting of the constitution. At M. Micheli's suggestion the Council passed a resolution requesting the U.S. representative to transmit to the United States Congress the expression of the Council's deep regret and sympathy at the death of Mr. Reed.

Recommendation of Working Party

The recommendation of the Working Party with respect to the creation of a Special Fund of \$3,000,000 was accepted by the Director, approved by the Executive Committee, and adopted by the Council. Thereupon, the chairman called for additional pledges to the Special Fund and succeeded in securing firm promises of contributions totaling over \$2,600,000, which, with a carryover of

\$385,000 from 1955, approximately met the additional income requirements of the 1956 budget. Included in the additional contributions pledged were \$546,000 by Australia, \$164,500 by Austria, \$120,000 by the Federal Republic of Germany, \$281,850 by Italy, \$236,500 by the Netherlands, \$116,822 by Switzerland, and \$939,600, subject to certain conditions, by the United States. Thirteen governments made definite pledges of additional contributions, and three reported that such contributions were still under consideration.

The Director, in reporting on progress since the third session and problems facing the Committee in 1956, made reference to the improved economic situation in many of the emigration countries in Europe and to the fact that many of the emigrants available for movement would require at least a minimum of vocational training if they were to qualify for the opportunities open to immigrants in the receiving countries. The U.S. representative pointed out that the Committee had failed to date to interpret its migration services sufficiently to insure the receipt of income adequate to cover the expenditures and that the Committee's assistance in the movement of refugees should win wider support, particularly from the member governments not directly concerned with emigration.

Of the total number of migrants moved by the Committee during 1955, 29,323 were refugees; 19,919 of these came under the terms of reference of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The corresponding figures for the 4-year period ending on December 31, 1955, were 139,189 and 83,188. The total number of all migrants moved in this 4-year period was 406,867.

Discussion of Director's Report

In the discussion of the Director's report many representatives pointed out that the need for migration from Europe will persist irrespective of the current high level of economic activity in Europe. In appraising the need for migration, they felt that consideration should be given to such factors as the density of population, the lack of living space, the increasing encroachment of European cities on agricultural land, the need for a more rational distribution of manpower, and the requirements of developing countries overseas for a continuing flow of migrants. The Australian representative pointed out that, if the more favor-

able opportunities for migrants in receiving countries are not exploited during periods of high business activity, it will prove difficult, if not impossible, to reestablish the flow of migration during periods of lower economic activity; in other words, that the continuity of migration is of importance to both emigration and immigration countries and contributes to the strength of the free world. In this discussion several representatives drew attention to the achievements of ICEM to date in providing shipping on many migrant routes where commercial shipping is unavailable or inadequate, in establishing cooperative services between emigration and immigration countries, and in building up, in the selection, processing, and reception of migrants, standards of performance that have reduced waste, confusion, and costs in this field.

Kurt Seidler, the Austrian representative, made a special plea during the course of the session for the assistance of other governments and ICEM in facilitating the emigration of increasing numbers of refugees arriving in Austria from Eastern European countries. Some 3,000 such refugees had arrived during 1955, and more were expected in 1956 because of easier access to Austria since the withdrawal of the Soviet forces under the provisions of the Austrian State Treaty. Dr. Seidler expressed the hope that other governments of the free world would assist Austria in providing asylum for the refugees whom Austria, because of her geographical position, receives in the first instance.

The Council adjourned the fourth session on February 24, 1956, confident that the activities of the Migration Committee for 1956 had gotten off to an auspicious start and resolved to convene the fifth session about October 1, 1956.

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

U.N. Sugar Conference

The Department of State announced on May 21 (press release 269) that the U.S. Government will be represented at the U.N. Sugar Conference, to be convened at U.N. Headquarters at New York on that day, by the following delegation:

United States Representative

Marvin L. McLain, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture

Alternate United States Representatives

Earl M. Hughes, Administrator, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture

Lawrence Myers, Director, Sugar Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture

Advisers

Thomas H. Allen, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture

Malcolm Baldridge, General Counsel, U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, Washington, D. C.

Richard M. Blake, Secretary, National Beet Growers Federation, Greeley, Colo.

William M. Case, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture

Paul E. Callanan, International Resources Division, Department of State

John J. Czyzak, Assistant to the Legal Adviser, Department of State

Eric Englund, Agricultural Attaché, American Embassy, London

Josiah Ferris, Vice President, American Sugar Cane League, Washington, D.C.

Ernest Greene, Washington Representative, Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association, Washington, D.C.

Hans G. Hirsch, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture

Wallace Kemper, President, Southdown Sugars, Inc., New Orleans, La.

Nat B. King, U.S. Mission to the United Nations, New York

Gordon Lyons, Executive Manager, California Beet Growers Association, Stockton, Calif.

Stanley D. Metzger, Assistant Legal Adviser for Economic Affairs, Department of State

Slater Miller, Washington Representative, Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association, Washington, D.C.

Thomas O. Murphy, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture

P. K. Norris, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture

Robert H. Shields, President and General Counsel, U.S. Beet Sugar Association, Washington, D.C.

Luis Rivera-Santos, Secretary of Agriculture and Commerce, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, San Juan

Dudley Smith, President, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, Washington, D.C.

Harry R. Turkel, Office of Regional American Affairs, Department of State

The present International Sugar Agreement, which was negotiated at a U.N. Sugar Conference at London in 1953, came into force at the beginning of 1954.¹ Article 42 provides that the duration of this agreement shall be for 5 years from January 1, 1954, and that in the third year of this agreement the International Sugar Council (the

¹ For background, see *BULLETIN* of Oct. 26, 1953, p. 542; Dec. 14, 1953, p. 823; and Mar. 29, 1954, p. 493.

administrative body of the agreement) shall examine the entire working of the agreement, especially in regard to quotas and prices. The Council, at its meeting at London, November 28-December 1, 1955, requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations to convene an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations in order to make possible an examination on a wider basis than is possible within the Council. Accordingly, the Secretary-General of the United Nations announced in March 1956 that a U.N. Sugar Conference would be convened on May 21, 1956.

The agenda of the conference, prepared by the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements (a body of the United Nations), will provide an opportunity to review the operation of the present agreement and to consider whether any changes should be made in the light of this review and the current situation in international trade in sugar.

U.N. Refugee Fund Executive Committee

The Department of State announced on May 24 (press release 277) that Christopher H. Phillips, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs and U.S. representative on the United Nations Refugee Fund Executive Committee, will attend the 3d session of the Committee convening at Geneva, Switzerland, on May 28. He will be assisted by Henry F. Nichol, conference officer, U.S. Resident Delegation for International Organizations at Geneva.

In a resolution of October 21, 1954, the General Assembly of the United Nations authorized the establishment of a United Nations Refugee Fund to enable the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to undertake a program designed to achieve permanent solutions of certain refugee problems by December 31, 1958. Under the program it was planned to take action to stimulate the integration of refugees into agriculture; to provide for their establishment in trades, small businesses, and professions; to plan the construction of housing for refugees; to provide vocational and other training for refugees to facilitate their integration or resettlement; to aid university students; to create community centers; to promote resettlement programs overseas; and to establish resettlement counseling services for refugees.

The Executive Committee was established by

the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations to provide necessary guidance to the High Commissioner in carrying out the program of permanent solutions. The Executive Committee determines the general policies under which the operation of the fund shall be planned, developed, and administered; determines the annual financial plan for the fund; adopts administrative regulations for the fund; reviews expenses incurred under the fund; and insures the taking of all necessary steps to provide for continuing supervision of approved projects.

The members of the Executive Committee are Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Colombia, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iran, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, and the Vatican.

132d Session, ILO Governing Body

The Department of State announced on May 25 (press release 282) that J. Ernest Wilkins, Assistant Secretary of Labor and U.S. Government representative on the Governing Body of the International Labor Office, will attend the 132d session of the Governing Body at Geneva, Switzerland, on June 1 and 2, prior to the opening of the 39th session of the International Labor Conference, which convenes on June 6. Meetings of various committees of the Governing Body will begin on May 28.

Mr. Wilkins will be assisted by the substitute U.S. representative, Arnold L. Zempel, Executive Director, Office of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor, and four advisers: Otis E. Mulliken, Officer in Charge, Social Affairs, Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State; Stuart Rothman, Solicitor, Department of Labor; B. Allen Rowland, Special Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce; and George Tobias, Labor Attaché, American Consulate General, Geneva.

The Governing Body usually meets three times a year to receive reports on activities of the International Labor Office, outline future work of the Office, examine and recommend the annual budget, and prepare agendas for the annual sessions of the International Labor Conference. It is responsible for establishing all ILO committees, setting their meetings, reviewing their work, and determining the action to be taken on their recommendations.

International Cooperation To Develop Water Resources

**STATEMENT BY JOHN C. BAKER
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE ON ECOSOC¹**

The problem of managing national water resources for the greatest benefit of their citizens is common to all governments. Those nations whose territories are subject to floods from great rivers or whose lands lie in arid zones face the more urgent problems. But, as increasing population and economic development result in rising demands for water, all countries will have to take steps to assure the best possible use of their water resources. Where two or more countries share those resources, as in the case of many river systems, their beneficial use for the good of all is of international concern.

Because effective use of water resources is of great importance to economic development, my delegation attaches great significance to this area of the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. We have, therefore, been glad to join with the delegation of France in sponsoring the draft resolution contained in document E/L.721. I should like to make a brief statement concerning this resolution and the report of the Secretary-General (E/2827).

Past resolutions of the Council have stressed the importance of the multiple-purpose approach to the development of water resources. They have also emphasized the necessity for interagency coordination, if international organizations are to make their most effective contribution to the solution of national and international water problems. The resolution before us would reaffirm our support of these policies.

The development of sound policies for the use of water resources is, of course, largely a matter of national responsibility. It is true that in the case of those important water resources which are shared by two or more countries, some form of bilateral or multilateral cooperation is desirable. Even in these cases, however, each national government concerned has the final responsibility for planning and carrying out any development of those resources within its territories.

As to water resources located entirely within

¹ Made in the U.N. Economic and Social Council on May 2 (U.S./U.N. press release 2403).

one country, the most that any international agency can do is to help make the world's knowledge and experience more readily available to governments, to help stimulate the development of new knowledge, and to demonstrate new or improved techniques.

Some of the specialized agencies of the United Nations have, from the very beginning, developed active programs in certain phases of water resources development. For example, WHO [World Health Organization] has for some time been especially concerned with environmental sanitation and the problem of providing safe water for human consumption; FAO [Food and Agriculture Organization] with the conservation and use of water for agriculture and fisheries; UNESCO [U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization] with scientific research on many aspects of water, especially for the improvement of arid zones; and WMO [World Meteorological Organization] with meteorology.

But beginning in 1952, and more particularly since 1954, there has been an important change in their activities as a result of the Council's recommendations. Since then, these agencies, together with the Secretary-General and the executive secretaries of the several regional economic commissions, have consulted with each other on a regular and systematic basis, with a view to preventing duplication. These consultations have served to highlight the interrelationships between all phases of the development of water resources and particularly the advantages of multipurpose development. We commend all the agencies involved in these cooperative arrangements.

Since this question was last on our agenda, considerable progress has been made in such specific fields as the assembly of data and the exchange of views and technical information among the interested agencies. We are pleased to note that, as a result of these interagency consultations, FAO is assuming responsibility for the study of watershed management in all its aspects and expects to complete a handbook on this subject by 1957.

We hope that, as these interagency consultations continue on a regular basis, all the agencies—and through them, governments—will acquire a better understanding of the interrelationships of all aspects of water-resource development. Each agency should constantly keep in mind that what it does in its own field may well have an impact on the activities of other agencies. It cannot ade-

quately plan its own program without taking into account the relationship of such program to the programs of other agencies. For example, a watershed project by FAO may have a direct bearing on a health project of WHO, or on an industrial or power project being undertaken in the same area.

The Secretary-General reports that the inter-agency group with which he has consulted with respect to work in this field has recommended that two types of activity be given especial attention by the appropriate agencies. We assume that this would be in addition to the approved work programs already underway. These are, first, remedying deficiencies in hydrologic data, and, second, examining the implications of integrated river-basin development. We agree that these projects should be given high priority.

So far as the first of these two projects is concerned, it is our understanding that WMO will not collect, compile, and publish hydrologic data but will help in establishing standards for their collection and compilation. Also, we assume that the hydrologic activities of WMO will be coordinated with those of such regional activities as the ECAFE [Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East] Bureau of Flood Control and Water Resources. The need for coordination in this field emphasizes strongly the desirability of filling the position of Water Resources Adviser to the United Nations.

As far as integrated river-basin development is concerned, it is clear that a single form of river-valley authority is not necessarily the answer for dealing with the problems of all river valleys. The important objective is to develop the waters of a river valley for the benefit of the people concerned. Different forms of political and administrative organization may be suitable for achieving this objective in different places.

There is another point that nontechnical administrators sometimes do not fully take into account. That is the long period required for the collection of basic data and for the economic and engineering analysis essential to successful river-basin programs. While the Council may feel that the water program has not proceeded at the rate or on the scale it had hoped for, a program of this character will never move very rapidly. The capacity of countries to assemble, analyze, and use the basic data for planning an integrated river-basin development is often limited. Moreover, the ability to

finance, construct, administer, and operate even relatively small and simple projects is frequently lacking. More than money, machinery, and expert advice is required. A long period of education and patient training at all levels is needed, from the man on the land who applies the irrigation water, to top officials who must administer policies and funds with integrity and foresight.

International agencies can usefully explore techniques for the exchange of information concerning developments on selected problems of common interest among administrators, engineers, and scientists. We note that the Secretary-General and other agencies have suggested the possibility of convening a world conference of water resources for this purpose. While such a conference may eventually prove to be desirable, we question whether such a conference would be of value at the present time. The world's water problems are of great diversity and complexity, and there are great differences in the interests of various regions of the world in those water problems.

We would suggest, instead, that the Secretary-General seek the assistance of a standing panel of recognized experts which he could constitute for this purpose. The flexible use of such a panel should enable the United Nations, its regional economic commissions, the specialized agencies, and governments to take action in the light of a thorough consideration of the technical, administrative, policy, and educational phases of water-resource development.

We suggest that the Secretary-General include in his next report information on progress in these various fields, together with his recommendations for further action.

Mr. President, this whole field of water-resource development is of utmost importance to the general economic progress of all member countries. Here, the leadership and coordination provided by the United Nations can be of great assistance to all. We hope that the Secretary-General, in planning his budget for submission to the General Assembly, will accord this activity a sufficiently high priority so that the important post of Water Resources Adviser can soon be filled with an expert of stature and experience. My Government will cooperate with the Secretary-General in every possible way to make this important program a success.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION¹

U.N. doc. E/Res. (XXI)/15

The Economic and Social Council,

Having noted the Secretary-General's report on "International Co-operation with respect to Water Resource Development",

Recognizing with appreciation the progress already achieved in strengthening international co-operation as a result of periodic inter-agency meetings on water resources,

Endorsing the recommendation of the Secretary-General that high priority be given to remedying deficiencies in hydrology data and to assisting in integrated river basin development,

Considering that the general subject of international co-operation with respect to water resource development and the study of arid regions has been of increasing concern to the United Nations,

Considering the growing importance of the utilization of brackish and saline water, either unprocessed or demineralized, for the economic development of areas where fresh water supplies are becoming insufficient,

Believing that there is a growing economic and social need for the most effective utilization and development of these water resources in view of the progressive increase in the world's population, the need for raising the standard of living of the peoples of the world, and rapidly increasing industrialization,

1. *Reaffirms* its support of Council resolutions 417 (XIV) and 533 (XVIII);

2. *Commends* the Secretary-General and the specialized agencies for the co-operation evidenced in the series of consultations on water resources already held;

3. *Urges* the Secretary-General and the specialized agencies to continue such consultations to the end that in so far as possible the activities of the United Nations organizations be carried on with full regard to the inter-relationships involved;

4. *Calls to the attention* of Governments the importance of demineralization of saline water and utilization of sub-soil water and urges them to exchange information on the findings of research concerned with a solution of these problems;

5. *Draws to the attention* of Governments the desirability of an increased use of the available technical assistance facilities, especially in the training of personnel in this field;

6. *Requests* the Secretary-General:

(a) To make appropriate arrangements for ensuring the collection, analysis and dissemination of information on current development of water projects, research programmes and related activities;

(b) To initiate, in co-operation with competent specialized agencies and with the Governments concerned, a preliminary inquiry on existing hydrologic services, plans for their extension and conditions for the execution of these plans;

(c) To constitute a panel of world known experts for

¹ Adopted unanimously on May 3.

reviewing, with the assistance of the United Nations Secretariat, the administrative, economic and social implications of integrated river basin development, and for advising on the proper action (including, if they deem it advisable, the convening of an international conference) to be taken in order to ensure world-wide exchange of experience and data in related domains;

(d) To report to the Council, not later than its twenty-fifth session, on progress in these fields and to formulate recommendations on further action that might be taken by the United Nations organizations.

TREATY INFORMATION

U.S. Signs Agreement With Turkey on Defense Use of Technology

The Department of State announced on May 18 (press release 267) the signing of an agreement with Turkey to facilitate the exchange of patent rights and technical information for defense purposes. The agreement was signed at Ankara, May 18, 1956, by Muharrem Nuri Birgi, Secretary General of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Foy David Kohler, American Chargé d'Affaires.

The agreement is expected to foster the exchange of technology for defense purposes between the two Governments and between the private industries of the two countries. Thus it should be of reciprocal benefit in providing for national defense and in contributing to the mutual defense of the North Atlantic Treaty area.

The agreement with Turkey is the latest to be signed of a series being negotiated with the NATO countries and with Japan. Other agreements of this nature have been signed with Italy, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Norway, the Netherlands, Greece, the Federal Republic of Germany, and Japan.

The agreements recognize that, wherever practicable, privately owned technology should generally be exchanged through commercial agreements between owners and users. They also note that rights of private owners of patents and technical information should be fully recognized and protected in accordance with laws applicable to such rights. The agreements are also intended to assure fair treatment of private owners when they deal directly with a foreign government. In addition,

the agreements provide for the protection of technical information communicated through government channels and for the establishment of arrangements by which owners of patentable inventions placed under secrecy by one government may obtain comparable protection in the other country. The agreements further provide as a general rule that, when government-owned inventions are interchanged for defense purposes, this interchange will take place on a royalty-free basis.

Each of the agreements provides for the establishment of a Technical Property Committee to be composed of a representative of each government. These committees are charged with general responsibility for considering and making recommendations on any matters relating to the agreements brought before them by either government, on their own behalf or on behalf of their nationals. One of the specific functions of the committee is to make recommendations to the governments, either in particular cases or in general, concerning disparities in their laws affecting the compensation of owners of patents and technical information.

The United States representative to the Technical Property Committees in Europe is assigned to the staff of the Defense Adviser, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations (USRO), 2 Rue St. Florentin, Paris.

Policy guidance for the U. S. representatives on the Technical Property Committees is provided by the Interagency Technical Property Committee for Defense, chaired by the Department of Defense. Representatives of the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the International Cooperation Administration, and the Government Patents Board are included. This committee is assisted by an industry advisory group representing major sectors of American industry concerned with defense production.

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Cultural Property

Convention for protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, and regulations of execution. Done at The Hague May 14, 1954.¹

Ratification deposited: Mexico, May 7, 1956.

Extradition

Convention on extradition. Signed at Montevideo Decem-

¹ Not in force.

ber 26, 1933. Entered into force January 25, 1935. 49 Stat. 3111.
Ratification deposited: Argentina, April 19, 1956.

Trade and Commerce

Procès verbal of rectification concerning the protocol¹ amending part I and articles XXIX and XXX of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the protocol¹ amending the preamble and parts II and III of the General Agreement, and the protocol¹ of organizational amendments to the General Agreement. Done at Geneva December 3, 1955.

Signatures: Haiti and New Zealand, December 3, 1955; Canada, February 9, 1956; Netherlands, February 13, 1956; Belgium, February 16, 1956; Australia, March 2, 1956; India, April 16, 1956; Greece, April 19, 1956; United States, May 11, 1956.

BILATERAL

Turkey

Agreement to facilitate interchange of patent rights and technical information for purposes of defense. Signed at Ankara May 18, 1956. Enters into force on the date of receipt by the United States of notification of constitutional approval by Turkey.

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Franklin Medal Presented to Department of State

Press release 271 dated May 22

The Franklin Medal, commemorating the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, was presented to the Department of State on May 22 by Clarence L. Jordan, chairman of the 250th Anniversary Committee, and accepted for the Department by Deputy Under Secretary for Administration Loy W. Henderson.

Mr. Jordan made the presentation on behalf of the Secretary of the Treasury and the United States Congress. Public Law 259, 84th Congress, authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to have struck 71 bronze medals commemorating the 250th anniversary of Benjamin Franklin's birth and, in cooperation with the Franklin Institute of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, "to provide for the presentation of" these medals. Twenty-one recipients are named in the act as institutions, enterprises, and societies of which Franklin was a member, founder, or sponsor. Fifty other recipients have been chosen as representative of Franklin's ideals in the broad fields of knowledge

and the service of man. The Department of State and the United States Information Agency have been acting for the Department of the Treasury in the presentation of the Franklin Medal to recipients outside the borders of the United States.¹

The face of the bronze medal shows Franklin's profile in relief with the inscription "Benjamin Franklin—1706—1956—Medal of the Congress—United States of America." The reverse of the medal bears the inscription: "Wise and Good Men Are the Strength of a Nation." Laura Gardin Fraser, sculptor of the Franklin Medal, also designed the medal commemorating the 200th anniversary of the United States Military Academy and the medals presented by the Congress to Gen. George C. Marshall and Col. Charles A. Lindbergh. Her husband, the late James Earle Fraser, created the memorial statue at the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia.

First Meeting of Foreign Service Advisory Committee

Press release 270 dated May 21

The Advisory Committee for the Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State held its first meeting at Washington on May 21. Nine members from private and academic life were invited by Secretary Dulles to form this group. They are:

Hamilton Fish Armstrong, Editor, *Foreign Affairs*
Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, U.S. House of Representatives
Ellsworth Bunker, President, The American National Red Cross
Robert D. Calkins, President, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C.
Robert Cutler, Chairman, Board of Directors, Old Colony Trust Co., Boston, Mass.
Clyde K. Kluckhohn, Director, Laboratory of Social Sciences, Harvard University
William L. Langer, Chairman, Committee on Regional Studies, Harvard University
Charles E. Saltzman, Henry Sears & Co., New York, N.Y.
Henry M. Wriston, Director, The American Assembly, Graduate School of Business, Columbia University

The Institute, under the direction of Harold B. Hoskins, conducts a continuous training program for the U.S. Foreign Service, the Department, and other agencies of government engaged in foreign affairs. Courses include orientation, language in-

¹ For texts of statements made at previous presentations, see BULLETIN of Feb. 13, 1956, p. 249, and May 14, 1956, p. 800.

struction, modern management training, and international studies.

During its 1-day session the new committee met briefly with the Secretary, was greeted by Under Secretary Loy W. Henderson, and reviewed with Director Hoskins the Institute's progress and future plans. Their agenda also included a tour of the Institute's present quarters, 2115 C St. NW., and a luncheon at Blair-Lee House.

Designations

E. Allan Lightner, Jr., as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, effective May 14.

Roy R. Rubottom, Jr., as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, effective May 16 (press release 252 dated May 14).

Jack D. Neal, as Director of the Office of Middle American Affairs, effective May 16.

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 3503. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Egypt—Modifying agreement of December 14, 1955, as supplemented. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington February 17, 1956. Entered into force February 17, 1956.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 3505. 16 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States and Austria—Signed at Vienna February 7, 1956. Entered into force February 7, 1956.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 3506. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Iran—Signed at Tehran February 20, 1956. Entered into force February 20, 1956.

Mutual Defense Assistance—Japanese Financial Contributions. TIAS 3507. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Japan—Modi-

fying agreement of July 12, 1955. Exchange of notes—Signed at Tokyo February 3, 1956. Entered into force February 3, 1956.

German Foreign Policy Documents

The Department of State announced on May 24 (press release 276) the release of another volume of the series entitled *Documents on German Foreign Policy, 1918-1945*. This is series D, volume IX, *The War Years, March 18, 1940-June 22, 1940*. The volumes are published cooperatively by the United States, Great Britain, and France from archives of the German Foreign Office captured by Allied forces at the close of World War II.

The volume opens with the minutes of the meeting at the Brenner Pass on March 18, 1940, between Hitler and Mussolini. The documents go through the period to June 1940.

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: May 21-27

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

Press releases issued prior to May 21 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 252 of May 14, 260 and 262 of May 16, and 267 of May 18.

No.	Date	Subject
269	5/21	U.N. Sugar Conference delegation (rewrite).
270	5/21	Foreign Service Advisory Committee.
271	5/22	Franklin Medal presented to Department.
272	5/22	Dulles: news conference.
*273	5/23	Nebraska editor to tour Germany under NATO.
274	5/23	Signing of GATT protocol.
275	5/23	U.S. and Canada to study boundary waters.
276	5/24	<i>Documents on Germany Foreign Policy.</i>
277	5/24	U.N. Refugee Fund Executive Committee delegation (rewrite).
278	5/24	Cutoff on Polish visa applications.
279	5/24	Dulles: anniversary of founding of Buddhism.
*280	5/25	Snow retirement.
†281	5/25	Holmes appointment.
282	5/25	ILO delegation (rewrite).
†283	5/25	Pan American Institute of Geography and History delegation (rewrite).

*Not printed.

†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

June 4, 1956

Index

Vol. XXXIV, No. 884

Agriculture. U.N. Sugar Conference	947
American Principles	
U.S. Policy on Right of Asylum	939
Working Together for International Understanding (Eisenhower)	915
American Republics. Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference	920
Asia. Anniversary of the Founding of Buddhism (Dulles)	926
Canada. U.S. and Canada To Examine Subject of Boundary Waters	940
Congress, The. Visit of President Sukarno of Indonesia	927
Department and Foreign Service	
Designations (Lightner, Neal, Rubottom)	954
First Meeting of Foreign Service Advisory Committee	953
Franklin Medal Presented to Department of State	953
Disarmament. Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference	920
Economic Affairs	
International Cooperation To Develop Water Resources (Baker, text of resolution)	949
Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference	920
U.N. Sugar Conference	947
U.S. and Canada To Examine Subject of Boundary Waters	940
U.S. Signs GATT Protocol of Supplementary Concessions	941
World Bank Reports \$21.2 Million Net Income for 9-Month Period	941
Egypt. Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference	920
Europe	
Financing the Continuing Movement of Migrants From Europe (Warren)	944
U.S. Policy on Right of Asylum	939
Germany. German Foreign Policy Documents	954
Health, Education, and Welfare. Working Together for International Understanding (Eisenhower)	915
Indonesia	
Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference	920
Visit of President Sukarno of Indonesia	927
International Organizations and Meetings	
Calendar of Meetings	942
Financing the Continuing Movement of Migrants From Europe (Warren)	944
Governing Body, ILO	949
U.N. Refugee Fund Executive Committee	948

U.N. Sugar Conference	947
Japan. Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference	920
Near East. Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference	920
North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference	920
Poland. Visa Applications Cut Off for Certain Polish Refugees	940
Presidential Documents. Working Together for International Understanding	915
Publications	
German Foreign Policy Documents	954
Recent Releases	954
Refugees and Displaced Persons	
Financing the Continuing Movement of Migrants From Europe (Warren)	944
U.N. Refugee Fund Executive Committee	948
U.S. Policy on Right of Asylum	939
Visa Applications Cut Off for Certain Polish Refugees	940
Treaty Information	
Current Treaty Actions	952
U.S. Signs Agreement With Turkey on Defense Use of Technology	952
U.S. Signs GATT Protocol of Supplementary Concessions	941
Turkey. U.S. Signs Agreement With Turkey on Defense Use of Technology	952
U.S.S.R. Transcript of Secretary Dulles' News Conference	920
United Nations	
Governing Body, ILO	949
International Cooperation To Develop Water Resources (Baker, text of resolution)	949
U.N. Refugee Fund Executive Committee	948
U.N. Sugar Conference	947
World Bank Reports \$21.2 Million Net Income for 9-Month Period	941

Name Index

Baker, John C.	949
Dulles, Secretary	920, 926
Eisenhower, President	915, 927
Lightner, E. Allan, Jr.	954
Neal, Jack D.	954
Nixon, Richard M.	927
Rubottom, Roy R., Jr.	954
Sukarno, Dr.	927, 928
Warren, George L.	944



the
Department
of
State

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

**U.S. Policy in the Near East,
South Asia, and Africa—1955**

The year 1955 witnessed no lessening of American interest in the countries and peoples of the Near East, South Asia, and Africa, and it brought no end to the difficult and complicated problems which have come to the United States from this vital part of the world. On the contrary, the old, basic issues, involving the resurgent and often strident nationalism of the peoples of the area, the problem of self-determination or "colonialism," and questions of the economic development of underdeveloped countries still persisted 10 years after the end of the Second World War. In addition, important individual problems such as the Arab-Israel controversy, Cyprus, and French North Africa have also remained as matters of American concern, whether directly or otherwise, because of the position of the United States as one of the leaders of the free world.

This 63-page booklet surveys significant political issues, problems of regional security, mutual security programs and U.S. technical and economic assistance, and the outlook in U.S. policy.

Copies of *U.S. Policy in the Near East, South Asia, and Africa—1955* are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Publication 6330

25 cents

Order Form

Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$ _____
(cash, check, or
money order).

Please send me _____ copies of *U.S. Policy in the Near East, South Asia, and Africa—1955*.

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City, Zone, and State: _____

